The Path of Sunnat

By:
Maulana Sarfaraz Khan Safdar

Translated By:
Mufti Afzal Hoosen Elias

ZAM ZAM PUBLISHERS

THE PATH OF SUNNAT

CHAPTER ONE

The discussion on the proofs and evidences in the Shariah

Many, many thanks and appreciations are expressed unto Allaah Ta`ala that He has made us amongst mankind. After having created us amongst mankind, He has further endowed us with the blessing of being Muslims. Further to this, He has granted us the everlasting favour of being amongst the Ummat of the Greatest of all creation, Hadhrat Muhammad Mustafa ρ. If we ever contemplate expressing our *Shukr* (gratefulness) for the innumerable bounties bestowed upon us by Allaah Rabbul Izzat, then not only will this be impossible, it is something beyond our capabilities. In fact, we are truly unable to even count the favours bestowed upon us. Allaah Ta`ala states in the Qur`aan Majeed,

وان تعدّوا نعمة الله لا تحصوها

"If you (try to) count the blessings of Allaah (bestowed upon you o man!), you will never be able to enumerate them."

The Qur`aan Kareem is an everlasting statute, fully encompassing way of life and a complete guide for practice

The Ulama of Jurisprudence have stated four sources of principle, proof and evidences in the Shariah: The Qur`aan Majeed, Sunnat, Ijma and Qiyaas. In fact, Ijma and Qiyaas are directly related to and derived from the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnat.

Insofar as the principles for the guidance of this universe are concerned, there are two parts. The first part comprises an all-encompassing principle, that which is immutable, unchanging, which has obligatory laws and practices, which is free from the contamination of man, whose words are protected, and which is an everlasting source of guidance for all creation. The name of this fountainhead and source of guidance is -- *Wahi Matloo* or the Qur`aan Majeed.

The true Math-hab or Deen (religion) is that one whose basis and foundation stems from truth. It is that whereby a differentiation can be made between good and evil beliefs, actions and character. It is also that whereby internal and external reformation can be effected thereby saving one from the punishment. It is that whose principles, together with being definitive are so complete and concise that they suffice for all worldly and Deeni needs. Allaah Ta`ala, The Creator of *Fitrat* (inherent qualities) has kept the foundation and basis of Islaam on *Fitrat*. Regarding this, Allaah Ta`ala mentions in the Qur`aan Majeed:

فطرة الله التي فطرالناس عليها لا تبديل لخلق الله

The true Deen (religion) is that one which operates on a definitive path chalked out by Allaah Ta`ala, and every true and proper *Fitrat* bows its head in acceptance to it. It is not something which is formulated (by man) and man has no intervention therein. A trait of a false and incorrect religion is that its basis is the results of whims, fancies and opinions. It has no truck or relation with *Fitrat*. It projects outer façade of attraction, whereas it is devoid of guidance.

Who occupies the mantle of formulating laws and what are its qualifications?

In proportion to how much knowledge a person has with regard to the future, to that level will he be in a position to make the most correct and applicable laws and constitution. Insofar as the means, experience, *Qiyaas, hawaas* (sensory perceptions), etc. of man attaining the knowledge of the future, is limited, incomplete and deficient. This is the reason why man will never be able to effectively formulate and prescribe laws and rules (whereby to live properly). Man's weak efforts in this regard, where governments etc. are formulating constitutions and the like, need to be altered ever so often to accommodate many things, and it needs constant patching. This fact is being witnessed all the time, and will be until the Day of Qiyaamah. The formulation of every set of laws and constitution has some or other motive. The lawmaker, if he has any compassion and feelings for the subjects, who are going to follow this law, and if he is their true benefactor and places their needs before his own, then he has to formulate such laws, whereby the adherents will be benefited. In order to achieve such a feat, how much of reflection and research will have to be made! Only such a person will be able to formulate such laws which are beneficial and not in need of changing, who encompasses perfect knowledge and is most knowledgeable. He must be a genuine benefactor and merciful, who is free from any motive and not in need of anything. It is apparent that besides the Creator of the creation none other has this complete and total knowledge. None is more merciful than Ar-Rahmaan and it is no hidden matter that none is more independent than As-Samad.

In essence, besides Allaah Ta`ala there is no other being who can formulate a more perfect and complete set of laws

and flawless constitution. *"Indeed, for Him (in His control) is all creation and matters."* In any case, is there anyone else who is more rightful to this mantle other than Him? *"There is no Hukm, except by Allaah."*

In this regard we see that this divinely revealed set of laws and constitution spans the entire creation. Every single creation of Allaah Ta`ala is subject to this system and subservient to the Law and Direction of Allaah Ta`ala. None has the power to oppose this system also. *"And you will not find in the Sunnat of Allaah any change."* If we had any choice of interference in this Divine system, then we would have made mangoes or almonds grow on the melon plant, we would have grown dates without their pits, we would have given horns on the head of donkeys, or removed the horns from bulls and goats, etc. We would have allowed our ignorance and silliness to play a part in this system. However, this system is beyond our control and free from any flaw and fault. It is unchangeable and flawless. Every single speck in the universe is being controlled to the minutest detail. Every single atom and creation is totally under the control of Allaah Ta`ala, from the heavens to the earth, from the earth to the stars, from the ground to the *Arsh*. Every single one of them is subject to His decree and is under His Control.

The implementers of the Divine Laws is man

From amongst all the creations in the universe, only mankind is such that he has been blessed by Allaah Ta`ala with the special abilities, skill and aptitude, and he has been given limited freedom of choice. He is expected to fulfil the Divine Laws by utilising this freedom of choice. **The name given to these laws is Deen and Math-hab.** Allaah Ta`ala has sent a Nabi in order to teach, remind and guide mankind in this Deen. For this very teaching and

guiding, Allaah Ta`ala sent the last and best of all Ambiyaa, Hadhrat Mohammad Mustafa ρ, who has brought to a close and perfection this Deen. Prior to his demise, before a distinguished crowd, on the sacred land of *Arafaat*, this Aayat was revealed, *"On this day have I perfected for you your Deen (religion), and completed upon you My favours, and I have preferred for you Islaam as a Deen."* [Surah Maidah, Ruku 1]

The purport of this sacrosanct verse was that until the Day of Qiyaamah there will not be any other religion and this Deen of Islaam will remain without any alteration or abrogation. **Whatever was needed for the guidance of man, has been revealed.** If any person has to introduce into the Deen anything which was not taught by Nabi ρ, then in reality he is making this claim that the Deen is incomplete and imperfect, and in need of his newfangled innovation. Alternatively, he is making this claim, that *Nauthubillah*, notwithstanding Nabi ρ being most kind and merciful (amongst mankind), did not show the best and most perfect way. In essence, just as he had a very high mantle amongst mankind, so too was the Deen he propagated. Who is capable enough to falsify this perfect Deen or to claim imperfections therein? There can never be any subtractions or additions to what is Divine. There is nothing, be it apparent or concealed, regarding man's life, which has not been accommodated for.

All knowledge is in the Qur`aan but,
The intelligence of man falls short of its comprehension

The all-encompassing truth of the Qur`aan Majeed and the perfection of Islaam

1. Khalifa-e-Raashid, Hadhrat Umar τ once said, *"We were amongst the most abased of man, and Allaah had*

granted us honour with Islaam, hence if we ever seek honour in anything besides what Allaah had honoured us with, Allaah (will once again) debase us." [Mustadrak, page 62, vol. 1]

2. Khalifa-e-Raashid and the Mujaddid of the first (Islaamic) century, Hadhrat Umar ibn Abdil Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) once mentioned during a lecture, *"Amma Ba`ad! After the passing of your Nabi ρ there is no other Nabi to come, and after Allaah Ta`ala had revealed His Perfect Kitaab, there is no other Kitaab to come. Those things which Allaah Ta`ala had made Halaal will remain Halaal until the Day of Qiyaamah, and those things which He has made Haraam will likewise remain Haraam. I am not a decision-maker of my own, I merely comply and follow the Divine Laws which have been laid down."* [Seerat ibn Jowzi, page 108]

After mentioning these words he said, *"Know! I am no innovator, rather I am a follower."* [Al-I`tisaam, page 101]

3. Hadhrat Imaam Maalik (rahmatullah alayh) – passed away 179A.H. – refuting bid'ah mentioned, *"He who innovates a bid'ah in Islaam, and he deems it a good deed, is indeed laying claim that Muhammad ρ has betrayed the Risaalat, because Allaah Ta`ala stated, 'On this day have I perfected for you your Deen…' therefore whatever was not (a part of) Islaam on that day can most certainly not be (a part of) Islaam today."* [Kitaabul I`tisaam, vol. 1, page 47]

4. Allamah Hassaamud Deen Ali Muttaqi Al-Hanafi (passed away 975 A.H.], stated in refutation of Bid'ah and the bid`atees, *"Indeed this specific gathering on the third day, is neither a Fardh nor a Waajib, nor a Sunnat nor Mustahab. There is also no benefit in it or any advantage*

for the Deen. In fact, it entails censure, criticism and reproach on the Salf, in that they did not enumerate it, also upon Nabi ρ because he had (supposedly) abandoned the rights of the deceased, and also upon Allaah Ta`ala in that He had not perfected the Deen (and that this Deen depends on these innovations!). Indeed Allaah Ta`ala states, 'On this day have I perfected for you your Deen…'" [from Tafheemul Masaa`il, page 172]

5. Imaam Rabbaani, Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) – passed away 1024 A.H. – stated in refutation of the bid`atees and Bid'ah, *"The darkness of Bid'ah has overwhelmed the lustre of the Sunnat and the splendour of the creed of our beloved Nabi ρ has been stained with the muddiness of new innovations. Surprising is (the attitude of) those people who deem and regard as good such bid`ahs and innovations, and they have firm belief in these Bid`ahs being deeds of virtue. They seek the completion of the Deen and the creed in these new accretions. They (even) propagate and encourage towards these innovations. Allaah Ta`ala had placed them on the Straight Path, but they had not reflected that this Deen was complete even before their innovations and that this blessed Deen was finalised and also that the Pleasure of Allaah Ta`ala lay in this (complete Deen minus the innovations). As Allaah Ta`ala had mentioned, 'On this Day have I perfected for you your Deen.' Therefore to seek the (further) completion of the Deen in all these innovations, would be tantamount to refutation of the import of this blessed Aayat."* [Maktoobaat, part 4, page 94, Maktoob 260)

6. Mullah Ali Qaari Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) – who according to some was the Mujaddid of the eleventh century, passed away 1014 AH – stated: *"Allaah Ta`ala states, 'On this Day have I completed for you your*

Deen…', hence we do not require or need any such matter in this Deen to complete or perfect it, which is not part of the Qur`aan Majeed or Sunnat." [Sharhu Fiqh Akbar, page 10 – Khaanpuri]

In summary, the Deen of Islaam is such a total and perfect system, that it is impossible to seek the pleasure of Allaah Ta`ala in any other way. In the presence of this total and complete way and system of life, there is definitely no need to even glance at any other way of life.

The veracity of the Qur`aan Majeed and the honour of islaam in the eyes of others

Those westerners upon whom the unfortunate Muslims look upon as beacons, where from the men to the women, children to elderly, they are imitated and followed to the tee. Their fashions, ways of living and customs are adopted. Let us have a look and see what their opinion of this beautiful Deen of Islaam is:

1. A Christian writer for a Beirut Christian tabloid, *Al-Watan*, writes: *"The Prophet of Islaam had chalked out the way for the Muslim nation to spread and subsist. If the Muslims study their Qur`aan and Hadith properly, they will find the solution to every problem therein."*

2. G. M. Ridwell writes, *"There is deep truth and veracity in the Qur`aan, which can be found in the words, that, notwithstanding their being concise, they exude strong and true guidance, which overflow with divine wisdom."*

3. German orientalist, Emmanual Dosh, writes, *"Owing to the aid of this Qur`aan, the Arabs have acquired a place amongst the elite nations of Europe.*

These Arabs have shown light where there was darkness. These Arabs had revitalised the intelligence of the Greek philosophers, and they propagated the science of philosophy, medicine and astronomy. They have also a share in modern science. We will always mourn and rue the day when Granada was taken from the hands of the Arabs."

4. Doctor Samuel Johnson writes, *"The import of the Qur`aan is so encompassing that it is suitable and apt for every age and era."*

5. Ludolph Kriel writes, *"The Qur`aan comprises Aqaa`id, Akhlaaq and based on this the entire edifice of laws is based. It has very wide-ranging and encompasses a wide range of applications…."*

6. A westerner writes in the book, 'Life of Muhammad' (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), *"As far as our knowledge extends, there is not a single book in the entire world, which has withstood any changes throughout fourteen centuries, like the Qur`aan Majeed."*

7. The famous writer, Doctor Morris Francis writes, *"Insofar as its excellence in religious teachings is concerned, the Qur`aan surpasses all other religious books. In fact, we can safely claim that whatever Scriptures were revealed from time immemorial, the Qur`aan is the best."*

8. Doctor Morris further states, *"The Qur`aan has had such an effect on this world, whose excellence cannot be surpassed."*

9. A doctor mentions in his dictionary, *"The special excellence of the Qur`aan is hidden in its all-encompassing truth."*

10. A famous translator of the Qur`aan Majeed states, *"A miraculous Book like the Qur`aan could not have been written by any human hand. This is a miracle in its own standing which is better than the miracle of giving life to the dead."*

11. Rev. Walrus B.D. writes, *"The religion of the Muslims which is based on the Qur`aan, is a peaceful and secure religion."*

12. Godfrey Higgins writes, *"The Qur`aan is the consoler for the weak and poor and it thoroughly rebukes the unjust."*

13. Another western Doctor states, *"The foundation of Islaam is on the Qur`aan, which overflows with the knowledge of etiquette, discipline and civilisation."*

14. A Mr. John Dewport, writes in his book, *Apology for Muhammad and the Qur`aan*, *"In reality, the Qur`aan is so pure from flaws that there is no need for even the slightest amendment or improvement. If it is read from the beginning to the end, then there is not a single word, which will bring shame or embarrassment to the reader's face (because there is no single word of obscenity)."*

15. Roman historian, Edward Gibbon, writes, *"The Qur`aan is the miraculous Scripture whose text is proven to be unchanged."*

16. Padre Imaaduddeen, notwithstanding his being a staunch enemy of Islaam and the Muslims, writes, *"The*

Qur`aan today is the same Qur`aan which existed during the era of Muhammad."

17. Mr. Gibbons states, *"The Qur`aan Majeed encompasses all laws. It does not only comprise Fiqhi laws, in fact, it includes civil issues, national issues and many other aspects of life, too. As for those laws which pertain to the spiritual and physical dimensions of man, the Qur`aan explains in explicit and simple detail. It comprises the laws of religion, social interaction, civil, trade, military, governmental, etc. It details every aspect of man, from, religious customs to worldly matters. The Qur`aan is a Guide for the salvation of the soul, physical well-being, general rights, rights of the self, and all worldly and spiritual aspects."* [Taken from Naweed Jaweed, pages 522-533]

This concise, complete and incomparable Kitaab struck awe, fear and nervousness in the kuffaar, such that the famous Briton Gladstone said in a loud tone, whilst holding out a copy of the Qur`aan Majeed, *"As long as this Book remains on earth, this world cannot become civilised or cultured."*

Harrington Thomas stated, *"The Muslims cannot live peacefully with another government whose religion is different. The reason for this is that in the presence of the laws of the Qur`aan, this is impossible."*

The Governor General in India wrote in 1843 to the Duke of Wellington, *"I cannot overlook this fact that the Muslim nation is our avowed enemy. It is for this reason that our official policy is that we seek the good offices with the Hindus."*

Such schemes and plots were hatched in order to eradicate the existence of the Qur`aan Majeed and to deviate the Muslims from their actual objectives, that even shaitaan is struck aghast and dumbfounded. Lord Michael had stated in clear unambiguous words, *"The aim of our teaching is that such youth are to be created whose hue and lineage (outer façade) be pure Hindustani, but whose heart and mind western."*

It was however the program of the English to snatch away the wealth of Imaan from the Muslims through their colleges, cinemas and clubs. Woe betide the Muslims who have not appreciated and valued the true worth of this Perfect and Complete Kitaab. They have not benefited any guidance or taken lesson for the benefit of their souls and bodies.

Wahi Ghair-Matloo` and Hadith

The second portion if guidance is that which is called *Wahi-Khafi, Wahi Ghair Matloo* and Hadith. This guidance was demonstrated in the best of examples by Nabi ρ, whose life was a perfect mix of all aspects of human-life. This is also known as the *Sunnat-e-Rasul*. The Qur`aan Majeed refers to this aspect of guidance as *Hikmat*.

و انزل الله عليك الكتاب و الحكمة

And Allaah has revealed upon you the Kitaab and the Hikmat

In this aspect of the Deen, Allaah Ta`ala has, just like in the Qur`aan Majeed, taught mankind many essential things. Just as man cannot exist and subsist without the Divine Laws, so too, is he (his salvation) dependant on the example of Nabi ρ. Following the Sunnat of Rasulullaah ρ is just as imperative and important as following the

Qur`aan Majeed. The reason being that in following both these Guides, there exists obedience to Allaah Ta`ala. Obedience to Allaah Ta`ala and to Rasulullaah ρ are not two divergent paths or things. Just as following the Qur`aan Majeed would mean obedience to Allaah Ta`ala, so too, would following the Sunnat of Rasulullaah ρ mean obedience to Allaah Ta`ala.

ومن يّطع الرسول فقد اطاع الله

And whoever follows the Rasul has indeed obeyed Allaah

It is a well-established, accepted and undisputed fact that there is none better qualified or learned to demonstrate the true import and meanings of reward, punishment, good and evil, than Nabi ρ. Those things which he has declared sinful and evil, can never be disproved by anyone else in the universe. Similarly, those things which he has declared good, can never be proved otherwise by any force on earth. Every good and fine etiquette and trait which is to be found the world over, that is generally accepted as cultured and cordial, is the direct influence and teaching of Divine Inspirations through the medium of the various Ambiyaa υ, more especially that of our beloved Nabi ρ.

Every aspect and teaching of Nabi ρ was divinely inspired. The chief objective of Nabi's ρ life was to propagate the teachings of Haqq and not to formulate them. Therefore he was merely obeying and following the divine instructions and it is likewise Fardh (obligatory) upon every person to obey and follow him. The one who refutes and denies his teachings and ways is a kaafir. The teachings and ways of no other person, besides the Rasul, will ever be able to attain this lofty mantle.

The teachings of Nabi ρ conform to the natural dispositions of man. If the guidance and teachings of The True and Perfect Guide, Hadhrat Muhammad Mustafa ρ, be followed and obeyed today as it is deserving to be followed, then it will not be impossible that the Muslims (of today) can encompass the same lustre and force of Imaan which existed in the Sahaabah τ. Through this Deen of Islaam and Sunnat of Rasul ρ can unity, true justice, perfect safety and tranquillity once again be established on earth. Never was there a perfect Guide like him (Nabi ρ) before and never will there be the likes of him until Qiyaamah.

From the time of birth until death, from times of happiness to times of grief and remorse, in fact, in every aspect of life, man needs not look for his salvation and remedy, anywhere else besides the Sunnat or Rasulullaah ρ and the Shariah of Islaam, which is protected and present from all angles. There is absolutely no need or even latitude for us to lift our gazes towards any other religion, example, way or custom. Alas! What need is there for the one who has a strong fire burning in his own home to go out and try to snatch or beg for light from a beggar? In fact, what need or necessity is there to steal the flickering dull lamp?

The status of the Sunnat in the view of The Saahib-e-Sunnat

Nabi ρ had stressed greatly on the adherence to the Sunnat and holding onto it firmly. He had expressed great sadness and also warned against abandoning it.

1). It is clearly stated in the narration of Hadhrat Irbaadh bin Saariya τ that Nabi ρ said, *"And binding upon you is my Sunnat and the Sunnat of the Khulafa-e-*

Raashideen, The Rightly guided. Hold on fast to it, with your canines and save yourselves from innovations, because indeed every innovation is a bid'ah." [Mustadrak, vol. 1 page 96]

This authentic narration explains clearly that it is binding upon every Muslim that he/she hold fast onto the Sunnat of Nabi ρ and his Khulafa-e-Raashideen τ. Besides this there is no other way. Delving and indulging in innovations leads one astray and bid'ah leads to deviation.

2). Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Abbaas τ reports that on the occasion of Hajjatul Widaa, Nabi ρ mentioned, *"O People! Indeed I have left amongst you such things, which if you cling to, you will never be deviated – Kitaabullaah and the Sunnat of His Nabi ρ."* [Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 93]

3). Hadhrat Aishah τ reports that Nabi ρ said that there are six such types of people whom he curses, and Allaah Ta`ala also curses them – amongst them is that person who abandons the Sunnat of Nabi ρ. [Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 36]

4). Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik τ reports that Nabi ρ mentioned on a specific occasion, *"Whosoever turns away from my Sunnat and not from amongst me."* [Bukhaari, vol. 2, page 757]

What can be a worse fate for the one who abandons the Sunnat, than if the Mercy unto Mankind, Rasulullaah ρ, says that he is not from his Ummat?

5). Hadhrat Huzaifah bin Yamaan τ reports that Rasulullaah ρ said, *"There will be those after me who will not be on my path, and they will not follow my Sunnat.*

Such men will rise amongst them whose hearts will be the hearts of devils, in the form of humans." [Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 127]

The Kitaabs of Ahaadith are replete with (the virtues and encouragement) to follow the Sunnat, that it will not be easy to enumerate them. However, for the intelligent, the few mentioned Ahaadith are sufficient to demonstrate the import. However, as for those who wish to remain oblivious of this fact, there exists no remedy for this obstinacy in the entire world.

Hadhrat Shah Waliullaah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) – passed away 1176 A.H.- writes, *"I say that the edifice and administration of Deen is dependant upon following the Sunnat."* [Hujjatullaah, vol. 1, page 170]

The value and grandeur of the pure teachings of Nabi ρ in the view of others

This is a clear and evident reality that the coming of Nabi ρ brought fruition and completion to the Deen from every angle. It was the seal of all prophethood. The Final Divine Message had reached earth. The final brick for the structure of Deen was put in place by the coming of the Last Rasul ρ. The universe was struck with brilliant lustre which outshone that of the stars, and it never set. Leave alone our own, even the others were constrained to acknowledge that the sun of Nubuwwat was a great benefactor of mankind.

1). A Mr. Edward, professor of a university, mentioned, *"The effect and success of the Prophet ρ, in the character and general reformation of society, constrains us to acknowledge his being a true benefactor to*

mankind." [Extracted from foreword of '*Taarikh-e-Hind*', vol. 2, page 340]

2). Mr. Thomas Carlisle writes in his book, Heroes and hero-worship, *"The pure-hearted and one with cleansed soul, Muhammad ρ, was free from worldly aims and objectives. His thoughts were blessed and his character totally blameless. He was an effective and forceful reformist, who was sent by God to guide mankind. The very speech of such a person was the voice of God. Muhammad ρ maintained as his mission the propagation of the truth, throughout his life. His followers can be found in great multitudes throughout the world and there remains no doubt in the veracity of Muhammad's ρ success."* [Extracted from 'Asr Jadeed', 18 August 1929]

3). A famous London tabloid, 'Near East' states, *"If we do not accept the value, greatness, virtue and honour of the teachings and statements of Muhammad ρ, then in reality we are devoid of intelligence."*

How unfortunate that this blessed lifestyle is revered and praised by others, whereas we seek solace in the imitation of others, following their ways and fashions. The cries of *ishq* (love for Nabi ρ) are all false, empty and hollow! We should ask ourselves the question as to whether we are displaying any affiliation to the Sunnat by introducing and following foreign ways and customs? The claims of love for Allaah Ta`ala and Nabi ρ are empty and devoid of substance. In this regard, the father of Molwi Ahmad Raza Khaan Saheb, Molwi Naqi Ali Khaan Saheb, stated, *"Claims of love for Allaah Ta`ala and Rasulullaah ρ without following the Sunnat is plain boasting and bragging."* [Sarwarul Quloob, page 139]

The crux of the matter is that the Kitaab and Sunnat are the basis of our creed, the foundation of our constitution, the

fountainhead of our administration, the source of our politics, the be all and end all of our living, the foundation of all our dealings and the source and headquarters of every aspect and ruling in our lives. There is not a single aspect in our lives that ever falls out of the ambit of the Shariah and its rulings. It is therefore imperative that we practice rigidly on the Shariah.

Ijma and unanimity are also proofs in the Shariah

After the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnat, Ijma is another strong proof in the Shariah. The Ijma of the Khulafaa-e-Raashiden, the Ijma of the Sahaabah τ and the Ijma of the Ummat of Muhammad ρ , are all correct and proofs in the Shariah. In this regard we will present some proofs to corroborate this, and it is requested that these be studied with an open unbiased mind.

The Khilaafat and Sunnat of the Khulafa-e-Raashideen

Nabi ρ has likened each of his special companions to guiding stars. It should also not be overlooked that just as Nabi ρ lauded his special companions, this praise and specialities were not restricted to them only. Allaah Ta`ala declares in the Qur`aan Majeed, *"Allaah has promised those amongst you who believe, and do righteous good deeds, that He will certainly grant them succession in the earth, as He granted it to those before them, and that He will grant them the authority to practice their religion, that which He has chosen for them. And He will surely give them in exchange a safe security after their fear, (provided) they worship Me and do not associate anything (partner) with Me. but whoever disbelieved after this, they are the rebellious."* [Surah Noor, Aayat 55]

This Aayat of succession displays the virtue and dignity lauded onto the Khulafa-e-Raashideen.

The word *'Istikhlaaf'* indicates that these personalities were not like the normal worldly kings and rulers, they were the deputies of the Rasul of Allaah Ta`ala ρ. They were proclaiming the Divine government and were foundation-builders of the Deen. They adhered firmly to the Deen and its teachings until all fear and awe for the non-Muslims dissipated. They remained worshipping their Rabb in peace and contentment. Their condition was such that, let alone their lives being free of the greater *shirk* (ascribing partners to Allaah Ta`ala), they were even free of the minor *shirk* (executing deeds for show, name and fame). It is far from logic that Allaah Ta`ala places someone on earth to propagate the Deen and administer the Ummat, and that these chosen ones are deprived of the blessings and trust of Allaah Ta`ala and His Rasul ρ.

This is the reason why Nabi ρ had appointed them as paragons of Haqq and he had instructed us to follow them diligently. In this regard, Hadhrat Irbaadh bin Saariyah τ reports from Nabi ρ that he said, *"Indeed those of you who will live after me, will see many differences (of opinions). It will be binding upon you (at that time) to hold on fast to my Sunnat and the Sunnat of my rightly guided Khulafa-e-Raashideen. Hold onto to it with your canines. And save yourselves from innovations, because indeed every innovation is a Bid'ah and every Bid'ah is deviation."* [Tirmidhi, vol. 2, page 92 / Ibn Maajah, page 5 / Abu Dawood, vol.2, page 279 / Musnad Daarmi, page 26 / Musnad Ahmad, vol. 4, page 27 / Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 95] –Haakim and Zahabi have authenticated this narration.

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states in commentary of this Hadith, *"The reason is that the Khulafaa practiced on nothing besides his (Nabi's ρ)*

Sunnat. Sunnat has been attributed to the Khulafaa because either they practiced upon it or they chose it by way of Qiyaas and deduction.” [Mirqaat alal Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 30]

From this we understand that whatever the Khulafa-e-Raashideen had deduced and practiced on by way of *Qiyaas* or *Ijtihaad*, is also classified as Sunnat. According to the blessed words of Nabi ρ, the Ummat has no choice in following the Sunnat of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen. They have to adhere to it firmly. Shah Abdul Haqq Muhaddith Dehlwi (rahmatullah alayh) (passed away 1052 A.H.) writes in commentary, *“If the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen issued a decree on any matter, even though their ruling may have been based on their Qiyaas or ijtihaad, it is also in accordance to (to be classified as) Sunnat. It can never be classified as Bid’ah, as some deviated people have said.”* [Ash-atul Lam`aat, vol. 1, page 130]

This text makes it apparent and clear that the ruling based on the *Qiyaas* and *Ijtihaad* of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen are also classified as Sunnat, and according to the words of Nabi ρ, it is necessary for us to adhere to and follow it.

Haafidh Ibn Rajab Hanbali (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 795 A.H.] states, *“Sunnat is the term given to that path which is followed and adhered to, upon which Nabi ρ and the Khulafa-e-Raashideen treaded.* ***This includes the beliefs, actions and statements. This is the perfect Sunnat.”*** [Jamiul Uloom wal Hikm, vol. 1, page 191]

It is as though the term Sunnat will also apply to the actions and statements of the general Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe-Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). However, the complete and perfect Sunnat is only that which has been mentioned. This is the reason why Sheikh Abdul Qadir

Jilaani Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 561 A.H.] defined the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat thus, *"It is imperative for the Mumin that he follow the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat. Sunnat is that which is established from Nabi ρ (be it practical or speech).* ***Jamaat refers to (those rulings) which the Sahaabah τ had unanimously agreed upon during the time of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen."*** **[Ghun-yatut Taalibeen, page 195]**

This is that group of the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat which is saved from every type of Bid'ah and innovation. In this regard, Allamah Sayed Sanad Ali bin Muhammad Jurjaani Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 816 A.H.] writes, *"The Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat is that group which is free from all types of bid`ahs."* [Sharah Mawaaqif, page 764]

In summary, the Sunnat of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen is a proof (in the Shariah) and its adherence is necessary upon every Muslim. Whatever was agreed upon by the Sahaabah τ during the era of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen, is the definition of 'Jamaat' according to Sheikh Saheb (rahmatullah alayh). Without accepting this, the import of Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat cannot be realised.

A misconception and its elimination

Some people are of the misconception that the Sunnat of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen comprises only that which is in accordance to (the Sunnat of) Nabi ρ. They also believe that if anything was not reported (in practice or speech) by Nabi ρ and if the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen had carried it out or instructed it, then it is not classified as Sunnat. In this regard, the famous Ghair-Muqallid Aalim, Ameer Yamaani, Muhammad bin Ismail [passed away 1143 A.H.] writes, *"It is established from the rules and laws of the*

Shariah that no Khalifah-e-Raashid can establish or propagate a thing which was not established from Nabi ρ. Hence, the congregating of Hadhrat Umar τ, who was a Khalifah-e-Raashid, with the masses on nights of Ramadhaan to perform Salaat (Taraaweeh), cannot be termed a Sunnat, rather it is a Bid'ah." [Subulus Salaam, vol. 2, page 13]

These are his errors: Firstly, for anything to be classified as a Sunnat of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen, there is no need for it to be precisely in accordance to the Sunnat practice of Nabi ρ. **Whatever they decreed through their *Qiyaas* or *ijtihaad* is also classified as Sunnat.** It is apparent that whilst their own *Qiyaas* and *ijtihaad* was not reported from Nabi ρ, the *maqees alaih* (basis of *Qiyaas*) was. For example, both, Nabi ρ and Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ had instructed 40 lashes and not more for an alcoholic, but Hadhrat Umar τ had instructed 80 lashes, and this was also Sunnat. Accordingly, Hadhrat Ali τ [passed away 40 A.H.] stated, ***"Nabi ρ lashed 40 (lashes) and Abu Bakr 40 lashes and Umar 80 lashes—and all this was Sunnat."*** [Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 72 / Abu Dawood, vol. 2, page 260 / Ibn Maajah, page 188]

Imaam Haakim (rahmatullah alayh) mentions also Hadhrat Uthmaan τ in his sanad, ***"And Uthmaan also completed 80 lashes, and all this is Sunnat."*** [Ma`rifat Uloomul Hadith, page 181]

This narration is reported in Muslim Shareef, hence no comment can be made on its authenticity and the narrator is Hadhrat Ali τ, who well understood the definition and differences between Sunnat and Bid'ah. This narration clearly mentions the actions of Hadhrat Umar and Uthmaan τ as Sunnat when it differs with the action of

Nabi ρ. Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 676A.H.] states in commentary of this Hadith, *"This narration proves that Hadhrat Ali τ regarded the actions of Hadhrat Umar τ with honour and that he regarded his rulings and statements as Sunnat and on Haqq. He also held the same opinion of Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ, contrary to what the Shiahs propagate."* [Sharah Muslim, vol. 2, page 72]

If it were imperative that the orders and rulings of the Khalifah-e-Raashid be in precise conformity to the rulings of Nabi τ, then this ruling of Hadhrat Umar and Uthmaan τ would have been bid'ah and not Sunnat.

Secondly, if the Sunnat of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen had to be in precise accordance to the Sunnat of Nabi ρ, then what is the reason for the mentioning and exclusion of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen? In that case, even every believer who is a strict adherent to the Sunnat of Nabi ρ will have to be followed. In that case, there would be no speciality to the Sahaabah τ, the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen and especially the Sheikhain (Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Umar τ. Since Nabi ρ had specifically stated his Sunnat and that of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen, there has to be some uniqueness in it. Especially since Nabi ρ used a conjunctive word (و) to couple his Sunnat to that of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen. This factor remains however as to whether the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen has a right to make (change) the Shariah. **There is no reality in this because the real *Shaari'* is Allaah Ta'ala. Even the Ambiyaa υ were the propagators and not *Shaari'*. It will be explained further on that *Qiyaas* and *Ijtihaad* are accepted in the Shariah.** In such matters the rulings, statements and practices of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen are not only proofs in the Shariah, in fact according to the words of Nabi ρ they are Sunnat. In fact,

the statements of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen are regarded as proofs based on the statement of Nabi ρ that we should hold on fast to their Sunnat, with our canines. In this instance, in reality we are obeying Nabi ρ, just as obedience to Nabi ρ is obedience to Allaah Ta'ala. As Allaah Ta`ala says, *"And he who obeys the Rasul, has indeed obeyed Allaah."* Nawaab Siddique Hasan Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1307 A.H.] writes, *"After Nabi ρ those things which the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen have established as Sunnat, are to be strictly adhered to, based on the instruction of Nabi ρ to do so."* [Ad-Deenul Khaalis, vol. 2 page 435]

As far as terming the action of Hadhrat Umar's τ appointing a Qaari to lead the Taraweeh Salaat in the month of Ramadhaan as a bid'ah, this will be taken in a lexicographic sense, which is not censured. This most definitely cannot be regarded as a Shar`i bid'ah which is accursed and censurable (this will be discussed more in detail later on in the book, Insha-Allaah). It is inconceivable that the Sahaabah τ would have accepted and practised upon an evil bid'ah. They would not have been worthy of the title 'Khalifah Raashid'. How then could they have been included as being guides? They would never have allowed an evil bid'ah to continue without having spoken against it and keeping silent.

Thirdly, Ameer Yamaani, refutes the statement of Allaamah Barmawi, *"Barmawi said when the four Khulafaa have agreed on any matter then it is a proof (in the Shariah), but not their individual views. The reality is this that to follow is not Taqleed. Infact to follow (make Iqtidaa) is one thing and Taqleed is another."* [Subulus Salaam vol. 2 page 13]

In this text Allaamah Ameer Yamaani refutes the view of Allaamah Barmawi that every statement of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen is to be followed. Whatever the case might be even their individual statements are proof. **In our view to make *Iqtidaa,* follow and *Taqleed* are all the same thing.** The *ghair muqallid* differentiates between these things. In this regard, Nawaab Siddique Hasan Khan Saheb writes, *"The meaning of Taqleed is to follow without question the view of that person whose view is not a proof. From this we understand that to accept the statement of Nabi ρ and to practice thereupon is not Taqleed, because the statements and actions of Nabi ρ are in themselves proofs."*

According to this definition, to accept every single statement of the Khulafaa-e-Rashideen, albeit not Taqleed, is however Iqtidaa and *Ittibaa* (to follow). The reason being that it is binding upon us to accept and follow their statements and actions, according to the explicit instruction of Nabi ρ. A Hadith has been reported exhorting obedience to Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Umar τ especially. ***"Rasulullaah ρ said, 'I do not know how long I will remain amongst you, therefore you should follow Abu Bakr and Umar after me.'"*** [Tirmidhi, vol.2, page 207 / Ibn Majah, page 10 / Musnad Ahmad, vol.5, page 385 / Mishkaat, vol.2 page 50 / Mustadrak, vol.3 page 75]

Imaam Haakim and Zahabi have authenticated this Hadith. Sheikhul Islaam, Ibn Taimiyah (rahmatullah alayh) writes, ***"The statements of Sheikhain are proof. When they have both agreed, then it is not permissible to reject it. Similarly the consensus of the four Khulafaa is also proof (in the Shariah)."*** [Minhaajus Sunnah, vol. 3 page 162]

The Sahaaba-e-Kiraam τ are also Mantles of Truth and their Ijma' is proof

After the Hadhrat Ambiyaa υ, none other is more pious, abstentious and Allaah Ta`ala-fearing than the Sahaabah τ. This is the reason why Allaah Ta`ala had blessed them with His everlasting pleasure. *"And the first to embrace Islaam of the Muhajiroon and the Ansaar and also those who followed them exactly. Allaah Ta`ala is well pleased with them as they are well pleased with Him."* [Surah Taubah, aayat 100]

Allaah Ta`ala had lauded the forerunners of this Ummat, be they Muhaajireen or Ansaar, with His everlasting Pleasure. **According to some Tafseers, the Tabieen also come within the ambit of this Aayat, and are included in the Pleasure of Allaah Ta`ala.** Allaah Ta`ala is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him. Rasulullaah ρ had also included them as paragons and guides of the Haqq for us to follow. In this regard, Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ [passed away 68 A.H.] reports that Nabi ρ said, *"The Bani Israeel are comprised of 72 sects and my Ummat are divided into 73 sects. Every single sect will be destined for the Fire except one."* The people enquired from Nabi ρ which one sect will be saved, to which he replied, ***"It will be that sect which will be on my path and that of my Companions."*** [Tirmidhi, vol. 2, page 89 / Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 129 / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 30]

In another narration, the words, "**و هي الجماعة**" appears. [Abu Dawood, vol. 2, page 275 / Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 128 / Ibn Majah, page 296 / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 130]

That is, the successful sect will be that group which follows the same path of the Sahaabah τ. This group will

adhere firmly to Islaam. From this narration we realise that just as the Sunnat of Nabi ρ and his Khulafa-e-Raashideen are examples for us to follow, so too are the practices and statements of the Sahaabah τ guides for us, as borne out in the narration, *"my path and that of my Companions."* Nabi ρ had shown to us that his blessed way and that of his revered Companions τ are paths to be followed and looked up upon by the Ummat. This is the yardstick by which we can gain proximity and closeness to Allaah Ta`ala. The lives of the Sahaabah τ are paragons of Haqq and they are the yardstick by which we can differentiate between Haqq and baatil. Besides (by way of) *Qiyaas*, this narration is proof that the Sahaabah τ are yardstick by which we can differentiate between Haqq and Baatil. Contrary to what some deviant sects have done by degrading and censuring the Sahaabah τ, thereby scratching at the roots of Islaam and defying the Qur`aan Majeed and the Sunnat of Rasulullaah ρ.

The reliability, justness, integrity, trustworthiness and piety of the Sahaabah τ are such well-accepted facts, upon which the basis of Islaam rests. By criticising and censuring them, a person is shaking and scratching at the foundation of Islaam. Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states, ***"And the Sahaabah, all of them are just and reliable, because the Qur`aan Kareem, the Sunnat and the consensus of reliable personalities denotes this clearly."*** **[Mirqaat, vol.5 page 517]**

Imaam Ibn Atheer Izzuddeen Ali bin Muhammed Jazri (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 630 A.H], writes, *"The Sahaabah τ share in every narration in all this, except criticism and censure (Jarah Wa Ta'deel) because the Sahaabah τ, all of them are just and reliable. No criticism can be made of them since Allaah Ta`ala and His Rasul ρ*

had purified and sanctified them. This is such a famous and well-known fact whose mentioning is even not necessary.” [Asadul Ghaabit Fi Ma’rifati Sahaabah, vol.1, page 2].

In summary, the Sahaabah τ are the yardstick for the Ummat in matters of Haqq and baatil, good and bad, Sunnat and bid’ah, reward and punishment, etc. etc. Whatever they executed was Haqq, Sunnat and leading to salvation. Every action and statement of theirs are means of salvation for us and a means of elevation and good fortune. Opposing and acting contrary to it only bodes destruction and annihilation.

The famous ghair-muqallid Aalim, Maulana Hafez Muhammed Abdullaah Saheb Ropari states, *“To cite a proof using the statement of the Sahaabah τ is included as part of Islaam.”* [Zameemah Risaalah Ahle-Hadith, page 3]

He further states, *“and this is also clear that there is a strong possibility that the statement of the Sahaabah τ are taken from the Hadith of Rasulullaah ρ. And even if it is from their understanding, then also its source can be attributed to Nabi ρ, because the Sahaabah τ had noted his way of proving and derivation. They understood well his indications and suggestions. They were privy of the life of Nabi ρ first-hand, which the rest of the Ummat were deprived of. This is the reason why the Ijtihaad of those who came later is always preceded by the statements of the Sahaabah τ. Since the Sahaabah τ are equal in such matters it is not necessary to pit the statements of one against the other. Hence this is the meaning of using the statements of the Sahaabah τ as proof.”* [Ibid. page 8]

If the Sahaabah τ had unanimously agreed on any matter, then none can question or comment on it. Sheikhul Islaam Ibn Taimiyah (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 768A.H] writes, ***"It is compulsory to follow the Ijma of the Sahaabah τ. In fact the Ijma of the Sahaabah τ is a very strong proof and precedes all others (i.e. those which are not mansoos)."*** **[Iqaamatud Daleel, vol.3, page 130]**

Hafidh Addunya Imaam Ibn Hajr Asqalaani (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 852 A.H] writes, ***"Indeed the Ahle-Sunnah Wal Jama'ah are unanimous that the Ijma of the Sahaabah τ is Hujjat (proof in the Shariah)."*****[Fat-hul Baari, vol. 3, page 266]**

There are a multitude of citations proving the veracity of the Ijma of the Sahaabah τ and it being Hujjat in the Shariah, but we will suffice on just these few, since it fulfils our present needs. This much has been established that after the Qur`aan Majeed and Hadith Shareef, the lives of the Sahaabah τ can also be used as a yardstick to differentiate between Haqq and baatil.

Ijma-e-Ummat

The *Ijma* and consensus of the blessed Ummat, as a proof in the Shariah, comes after the Sunnat of the Khulafa-e-Raashideen and the *Ijma* of the Sahaabah τ. In lauding praises and honour on this blessed Ummat, Allaah Ta`ala states in the Qur`aan Majeed, *"You are the best of nations, who have been taken out for (the guidance) of mankind. You encourage good and forbid from evil, and you bring Imaan in Allaah."* [Surah Aal-e-Imraan]

Allaah Ta`ala has not described this **Ummat** as powerful or wealthy, rather He has described them **as the best and fortunate.** The reason being that it is the duty of this

Ummat to encourage towards good works in this world and to prevent from evil. This benefit is not only restricted to one single nation, but rather for the benefit and salvation of the entire mankind. **Nabi ρ said, regarding this Ummat, *"You are the witnesses of Allaah on earth."* [Muttafiq Alaih / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 145]**

Whatever this Ummat regards as good, Allaah Ta`ala also regards as good, and whatever this Ummat regards as evil, Allaah Ta`ala regards likewise. This Ummat are witnesses of Allaah Ta`ala on earth. This is also the reason why on the Day of Qiyaamah, the fate of all other previous Ummats lies in the testification of this Ummat. Another speciality of this Ummat is that they will never unite on deviation.

After presenting this Hadith, Imaam Haakim (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 405 A.H.] comments, *"This proves that Ijma is a proof (in the Shariah)."* [Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 120]

Allamah Shamsuddin Abu Abdallah Az-Zahabi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 748 A.H.] writes, *"(This Hadith) proves that Ijma of the Ummat is also a proof (in the Shariah)."* [Talkheesul Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 120]

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) writes in commenting on the Hadith, *"Indeed Allaah will not unite this Ummat on deviation", "In this Hadith is proof of the veracity of Ijma."* [Mirqaat ala Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 30]

There are countless proofs denoting the veracity and acceptability of Ijma'. This is also discussed in detail in the chapters of Usools. The famous Sheikhul Islaam Ali bin Muhammad Buzdawi Al Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 482 A.H.] states, *"The example of Ijma is*

like an aayat of the Qur'aan or Hadith-e-Mutawaatir. Just as it is compulsory and binding to practice on this similar is the case with Ijma. ***The denier of Ijma is a kaafir.****"* [Usool Bazdawi, vol. 3, page 361]

Sheikhul Islaam ibn Taimiyah (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"And Ijma is one of the greatest proofs (in the Shariah)."* He state at another juncture, *"And however Ijma of the Ummah is Haqq in itself.* ***This Ummat will never unite on deviation.*** *Similarly Saheeh Qiyaas is also Haqq and a proof (in the Shariah)."* [Al Husbah, page 59]

The practices of Khairul Quroon (best of eras) is also a Hujjat

After the Sahaabah τ, the execution or exclusion of any action by the Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen, is also a proof in the Shariah. It is also necessary that we follow them. There are numerous Ahaadith which prove this contention. Keeping this discussion brief, we will cite here just a few.

Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ [passed away 32 A.H.] said, *"Nabi ρ said, 'The best of people are (those in) my era, and then those after them and then those after them. Thereafter such a nation will come whose promises will precede their testification and whose testification will precede their promises."* [Bukhaari, vol. 1, page 362 / Muslim, vol. 2, page 309 / Masnad Tayaalisi, page 39 / Mawaarid-uz Zam`aan, page 569]

Hadhrat Umar τ reports that Nabi ρ said, *"I give you Wasiyat regarding my Companions (that you follow them), and then those who follow them and those who follow them. Thereafter, falsehood will become rife, such that a person will make promises without honouring it and testify without seeking witnesses. Therefore for that person who*

wishes to enter Jannat, he should not deviate from the Jamaat." [Masnad Abu Dawood Tayaalisi, page 7 / Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 114 / Mishkaat, vol.2, page 554]

Hadhrat Imraan bin Husain τ [passed away 52 A.H.] reports from Nabi ρ, *"Rasulullaah ρ said, 'The best of people are (those) in my era, then those after them and then those after them. Thereafter such a people will come who will bear testimony even before they are asked."* [Mustadrak, vol.3, page 471 / Tirmidhi, vol.2, page 45]

Another narration has it in the following words, *"(And after the best of eras) such a people will come who will deceive and they will not be trusted with Amaanat."* [Tirmidhi, vol.2, page 45]

Another narration has it thus, *"And these people will take oaths and not fulfil them."* [Abu Dawood, vol.2, page 284]

This is demonstrated clearly by these narrations that the people who will come after the best of eras will be such that they do not value and grant due respect to the Deen, as was done during the best of eras. Lies and deceit will become rife. Unnecessary and unfounded oaths will be taken. Amaanat will have no value and deceit will become a trade. People will be devoid of the fear of Allaah Ta`ala and concern for Aakhirah. In satisfying the stomach, people will not differentiate between Halaal and Haraam. People will take oaths and vows and make no effort in fulfilling them. In short, every aspect of their lives will be corrupt. It is apparent that trustworthiness, truthfulness and love for the Haqq which was prevalent during the best of eras, will be no more after their passing. After the Khairul-Quroon, besides lies, deceit, mistrust and false oaths all sorts of bid'ahs will emerge which will oppress this Deen of Islaam. Bid'ah will replace the Sunnah. Without doubt

fitnahs also reared their head during the time of the Khairul-Quroon, but—firstly they were much less then the worldly and Deeni fitnahs which came later on and secondly the majority during the Khairul-Quroon rejected it. In fact, they even sacrificed their lives to annihilate these fitnahs. This commitment and urge to combat evil is sorely lacking in those who came afterwards.
Hadhrat Aishah τ narrates, *"A man asked Nabi ρ who is the best of people. He replied, 'The era in which I am and then the second and then the third.'"* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 309]

Hadhrat Imaam Muhyuddeen Abu Zakariyya bin Sharf An-Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 676 A.H.], commenting on this Hadith, cites different interpretations for the word قرن (era). In the end he states, *"The correct view is that the era of Nabi ρ was that of the Sahaabah τ, the second was that of the Tabieen and the third of the Tabe Tabieen."*[Sharah Muslim, vol. 2, page 309]

From the foregoing discussion this is apparent, **that there are three eras which were included as being the best of eras.** It is these three eras which are called ***Quroon-e-Thaalitha*** *(the three eras)* and ***Quroon Mash-hoodun laha bil Khair*** *(The eras which have been classified as the best).* This much has also been established that the first of these three eras is that of the Sahaabah τ, the second of the Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) and the last of the Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim).

The famous Islaamic historian, Allamah Abdur Rahmaan bin Khuldoon Al-Maghrabi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 808 A.H.] writes, *"It is appropriate that the Salf carry forth their actions on that which the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen expressed themselves. They were the best of this Ummat. If we make them the targets for abuse, then who*

are we going to specify as paragons of justice? And Nabi ρ said, 'The best of people are (in) my era and then those after them.' He said this twice or thrice. 'Thereafter lies will become rife.' That was the era of justice which he specified for the first (three) eras. Be warned! Save yourselves and your tongues from making any one of them targets for your abuse." [Muqaddamah Ibn Khuldoon, page 218]

The Allaamah further states in describing the word *adaalat* (justice), *"Adaalat is a wazeefah (daily practice) and a speciality of the Deen."* [Muqaddamah, page 224]

It has been established that the 'best of eras' includes the first three eras, that is, the era of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). It also stated in the books where the personalities of the Deen are mentioned, **that this (best) era lasted until around the 220 A.H.** These are the personalities in whose steps we are to follow, thereby gaining eternal salvation. This was the best of groups in this Ummat. It is appropriate that at this juncture we consider and cast a fleeting glance on those who raise objections on the personalities of these great eras. Let us see what the other group has to say.

Molwi Abdus Samee Saheb writes, *"The narrations of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood, Hadhrat Abu Hurairah and Hadhrat Imraan bin Hussain τ which appear in Muslim Shareef etc. appear with doubt. Some narrations state that Nabi ρ mentioned two eras after his and some three. How do we know that the best of eras were three or maybe four…"* [Anwaarus Saati`a, page 20]

Reply:

The narrations which we had listed of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood, Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab, Hadhrat Imraan bin Hussain and Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anhum ajmaeen) are all specific regarding three eras. There is no question about a fourth era. The narration of Hadhrat Ibn Mas`ood τ appears on several occasions in Bukhaari Shareef (for example, vol. 1, page 362 / vol. 1, page 515 / vol. 2, page 951 and vol. 2, page 985). None of these appears with any words of doubt nor do they mention a fourth era. The narration of Hadhrat Ibn Mas`ood reported by Imaam Muslim also has no doubt in it. However, as for those narrations which were reported in the second category by Imaam Muslim (rahmatullah alayh), by Hadhrat Ibn Mas`ood, Hadhrat Abu Hurairah and Hadhrat Imraan bin Hussain (radhiallahu anhum ajmaeen) there appear some words of doubt. However, the principles and rules of Imaam Muslim (rahmatullah alayh) are to be considered. He states in his *Muqaddamah* (foreword) on pages 3 and 4, *"In the first category we will only report narrations from such narrators whose memory and reliability are above question, and there appears no doubt or error (in their narrations). In the second category we will narrate such narrations where the narrators' memory and reliability are not of the same standing as those of the first and also error and doubt does creep into them."* In accordance to this principle and categorisation of Imaam Muslim (rahmatullah alayh), the narration of three eras is absolutely authentic. As for those narrations where four eras are mentioned, this is due to the doubt and uncertainty of the narrators. This is the reason why, after mentioning the narrations wherein there is doubt, Imaam Muslim (rahmatullah alayh) lists the narration of Hadhrat Aishah τ, wherein she mentions three eras, as a seal over the other uncertain narrations. This is to confirm that only three eras are applicable. The narration of three eras are authentic and the ones with doubt are due to the uncertainty of the

narrators. The fact that Imaam Muslim placed these narrations in the second category are also worthy of consideration. In some of them these words appear, *"And Allaah knows best, did he ρ mention three (eras) or not."* And in some narrations it appears thus, *"I do not know whether Rasulullaah ρ mentioned after his era another two or three."*
The same words are quoted from Hadhrat Imraan τ in Bukhaari Shareef. From these narrations we discern the uncertainty of the narrators regarding the exact words of Nabi ρ. This uncertainty has no bearing on the narrations of certitude which were reported (from amongst others, Hadhrat Ibn Mas`ood, Hadhrat Umar, Hadhrat Aishah τ, etc.). These narrations specifically state only three eras. There is absolutely no words or doubt or uncertainty in their narrations. It is indeed strange that one will consider the narrations which have doubt and uncertainty as to the exact number of eras mentioned by Nabi ρ and completely bypass and ignore those (many) narrations wherein there is certitude.

Another objection

Molvi Abdus Samee Saheb states further that these narrations mention the word قرن which has many possible meanings. This word could mean the leader of a tribe, and according to some it could mean an era, and here also there is a difference of opinion, since it could refer to 10, 40, 70, 100 and even 120 years. [Anwaarus Saat'ia, page 20]

Reply

This is a grave error of the Molvi Saheb that he sometimes extracts the meaning from the dictionary and sometimes he takes support by using the definition of others. Had he taken the little effort to refer to and study the Hadith of

Nabi ρ, then all his doubts and reservations would have been removed. He had realised by himself and conceded that some narrations are explanations and commentaries of others [Anwaarus Saat`ia, page 27]. The narration of Hadhrat Aishah τ which was mentioned earlier as stated in Muslim Shareef where Nabi ρ replied to the question of someone that the best of eras is the one in which he ρ is, and thereafter the next and then the next. This reply was given by Nabi ρ to the question: *Who are the best of people?* We establish from this clear and authentic narration that Nabi ρ had restricted the best of eras to three. By the use of the word ثمّ, Nabi ρ differentiated between the three eras. Another point is that Nabi ρ did not refer to the meaning of قرن as being the leader of a tribe, and there is no need for us to refer to or page through a dictionary to see this! In fact, Nabi ρ referred to قرن as being a generation of people (an era). He further clarified that this first era (generation) referred to that of the Sahaabah τ, and the second to the Tabieen and the last to the Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim ajmaeen).

Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri τ reports that Nabi ρ said, *"Such a time will dawn on the people when a group amongst them will wage jihad. It will be asked of them if any one of them is a companion of Rasulullaah ρ (Sahaabi), to which the reply will be in the affirmative. They will attain victory on account of this. And then such a time will dawn on the people when a group amongst them will wage jihad. It will be asked of them if any one of them is a companion of the Companions of Rasulullaah ρ (Tabieen), to which the reply will be in the affirmative. They will attain victory on account of this. And then such a time will dawn on the people when a group amongst them will wage jihad. It will be asked of them if any one of them is a companion of the companions of the Companions of*

Rasulullaah ρ (Tabe Tabieen), to which the reply will be in the affirmative. They will attain victory on account of this." [Bukhaari Shareef, vol. 1, page 515 / Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 308]

The narration of Hadhrat Aishah τ is as crystal clear as daylight that the meaning of the best of eras is not ambiguous. In fact, according to the blessed words of Nabi ρ the best of eras are the first, second and third (generations of Islaam). Even the word قرن is not ambiguous and refers to an era and generation. Now considering the narration of Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri τ, we see clearly that the best of eras are those of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). There is no need for us to interpret the word قرن to mean 40, 70, 100 or 120 years. **In the presence of the authentic and clear Ahaadith, there is no need to pay any heed or attention to this Molvi Saheb's writings.**

Note:

There is a narration of Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri τ which appears in Muslim Shareef in the second category as a corollary, which mentions four eras. However, Haafidh Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) writes in commentary, *"Regarding the narration in Muslim where four eras are mentioned, this is a unique narration. Most of the narrations are limited to three (eras)."* [Fat-hul Baari, vol. 7, page 2]

From this we realise that according to the authentic narrations there are only three eras, which include that of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). The mentioning of the fourth era which appears in some narrations, are, according to the Muhadditheen unique and exceptional cases. **It is an accepted principle**

of Hadith that a unique narration cannot be taken and used to estrange authentic narrations. The unique narrations are themselves not taken into consideration as reliable proof. [See Taujeehun Nazar, page 221]

Third objection

This Molvi Saheb states, *"No one should labour under the impression that whatever occurred during the first eras was all good and blameless, because all bid`ahs, like qadr, arjaa, khuruj, rafadh, etc. were born in the third era. The Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat cannot use or base this 'best of eras' as a reason for good."* [Anwaarus Saat`ia, page 29]

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb had excelled by stating, *"The meaning is not this that during those three eras any deed which was initiated by just anyone is regarded as a Sunnat. There is mentioning here even of being Sunnat. Otherwise the creeds of Jabariyyah and Qadariyyah were initiated during the era of the Tabieen. The assassination of Hadhrat Hussain τ and the oppressions of Hajjaaj bin Yusuf also occurred during this era. So what, Nauthubillah, can we refer to these also as Sunnat?"* [Jaa-al Haqq wa Zahaqal Baatil, page 217]

Reply

Both these objectors are guilty of one principle error. They seek excuse for opening the doors of bid'ah by using long arguments. They seek to prove that if the best of eras refers to the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen, **then what about the accretions and evils which took place during those times?**

Whereas no one has ever labelled these evils as being Sunnat. They seek to prove that since these accretions took place during the best of eras, we should either label them all as Sunnat or not use this argument of the 'best of eras' against any innovation (that if it did not occur then, it is not part of Deen). There should be no impediment in their branding any innovation as whether it is a Sunnat or at least a *Bid`ah-e-Hasanah.* In reality they have not pondered deeply into the matter. There is no argument that the word قرن refers to an era/generation. **However, Nabi ρ had himself defined and narrowed down the scope and options of this meaning. It is clearly gleaned from the Hadith that Nabi ρ did not refer to the word قرن as merely an era but rather as the individuals of that era. There is a world of difference between an era and the individuals of an era.** In this instance it is clear that the reference here is specifically to the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). They were the individuals who lived in those eras. In this regard we had already quoted from Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) and Ibn Khuldoon that the reference of 'best of eras' is made to the pure and chaste souls who were the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). In fact, if one peruses and studies the Hadith, even scantily, then this fact will be apparent. The Hadith of Hadhrat Aishah τ clearly states that the question asked to Nabi ρ was: ***Who** are the best of people?* **The questioner asked regarding a group of persons and not regarding a time-frame.** In reply to this question Nabi ρ replied that the best of people are his Companions and then the next and the next. It is illogical that when the questioner asked regarding a group pf people and the reply should be regarding merely a time-frame. There would be a world of difference between the question and answer, in that case. One narration in Bukhaari Shareef states, *"The best of people are (in) my قرن"***,** another narration states, *"The best*

of you are (in) my قرن'. A narration in Muslim Shareef etc. states, *"The best of my Ummat are (in) my قرن."* All these narrations demonstrate as clear as daylight that Nabi ρ was not referring to the time in which he was residing, **rather the words الناس, كم and أمّتي all refer to particular inhabitants and people who lived in those respective eras.**

Even the narration of Hadhrat Umar τ, which was mentioned previously, where Nabi ρ said that he is making a bequest regarding his Sahaabah τ, and then those after them and those after them (that they be followed), clearly expounds this view. **Nabi ρ did not say that he is making a bequest about the era in which the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen live.** In short, Nabi ρ did not bequest that the three eras in which those personalities lived be followed, rather that these personalities, themselves, be followed. As for the sanctity of the Sahaabah τ themselves, there is no need to dilate and expound. The Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) were those who followed in the footsteps of the Sahaabah τ, and the Tabe Tabieen followed in the footsteps of the Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). If the Tabe Tabieen were not following in the shade of the Tabieen or the Tabieen not in the shade and mould of the Sahaabah τ, then they would not have been worthy to be called thus. These titles (of Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen) would not have been applicable. Like the title of Sahaabah, which refers to that person who saw Nabi ρ in the state of Imaan and died a Muslim. The person who deviated from the Path of Nabi ρ was not a Sahaabi. Such a person was either a murtadd or munaafiq.

Keeping all this in mind, let us now ask Molvi Abdus Samee Saheb and Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan, **which Sahaabi, Tabiee or Tabe Tabiee initiated a bid'ah,**

became Jabariyyah, Qadariyyah or Raafidhi? Which Tabiee assassinated Hadhrat Imaam Hussain τ or consented to the oppression of Hajjaaj? It is clear that these perpetrations and even worse did take place during that era, but this is not what is meant for us to follow in those eras.

We are to follow in the shade and footsteps of the inhabitants of those eras, namely the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). **None of these great personalities ever initiated any bid'ah or perpetrated oppression.** As for those who deviated from the Path shown by Nabi ρ, they were neither Sahaabah, Tabieen nor Tabe Tabieen. We have not been asked to follow these transgressors or their ways. In fact, we have to oppose them and their ways. As for any of their *ijtihaadi* errors, this is entirely another matter. The blatant error of Molvi Abdus Samee and Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan is that they misinterpreted the meaning of the term 'best of eras'.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb, also stated in further objection to his understanding of the 'best of eras', *"There is no mention here of being Sunnat."* Subhaanallah! What a strange manner of thinking for a mufti. The fact that Nabi ρ stated that the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) be followed and that their Path not be deviated from, then this in itself is part of his ρ, Sunnat. It is clearly stated in the Hadith of Hadhrat Umar τ that Nabi ρ said, *"I make a bequest for you (to follow) my Companions, then those after them and then those after them….Hold on fast to the Jamaat."*

Our Nabi ρ has explicitly instructed that we stay firm with the Jamaat of Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen and not leave their Path. And then Mufti Saheb says that there

is no mention of Sunnat! It is as though according to Mufti Saheb, the bequest and explicit instruction of Nabi ρ is not part of the Sunnat. He implies that the actual word Sunnat must appear otherwise it is not Sunnat.

This then is the research of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan. Now listen to what Molvi Abdus Samee Saheb has to say. After mentioning the Ahaadith of the *Khairul Quroon*, he writes, *"No mention is made of bid'ah or innovation in these narrations."* [Anwaarus Saat`ia, page 26] – This is also a strange way of extracting proof.

There *is* no mention in these narrations of bid'ah or innovation, but Nabi ρ had made a bequest and given an explicit instruction to hold firmly to the Path of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen. The reason being that these personalities understood fully the true meaning of following the Sunnah and acquiring the Pleasure of Allaah Ta`ala and Nabi ρ. They had true fear of Allaah Ta`ala and were perfect examples for the Ummat in practicing the Deen. In another narration, Nabi ρ said, *"Save yourselves from innovations. Every innovation is a bid'ah and every bid'ah is deviation. Whoever innovates in this matter (Deen) of ours is not of us and is rejected."* In this Hadith, we are explicitly instructed to save ourselves from bid'ah. In the Hadith of *Khairul Quroon* a bequest is made to follow. Nabi ρ emphasised practicing and following the Path of Sunnat. This implies that the Path followed by the seniors *is* the Sunnat. And the Hadith where bid'ah is discouraged, is a clear exposition that opposing and acting contrary to the ways of *Khairul Quroon* is bid'ah, innovation and rejected.

Fourth Objection

Molvi Abdus Samee Saheb writes that Hadhrat Shah Waliullah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Izaalatul Khufa* that from the *Khairul Quroon* the first era ended with the demise of Nabi ρ, the second with the demise of Hadhrat Umar τ and the last with Hadhrat Uthmaan τ, who was martyred in 35 A.H. And that Maulana Ahmed Ali Saheb Saharanpuri (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1297 A.H] stated that this interpretation of *Khairul Quroon* appears most appropriate and applicable. [Anwaarus Saat`ia, page 21]

Reply

The import of Hadhrat Shah Saheb's view would be that to follow the beliefs, path and actions of all the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen who came after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthmaan τ, is contrary to the *Khairul Quroon*. This view is clearly and absolutely baatil.

Firstly because in the first authentic narrations it has been established that it is necessary for the Ummat to follow in the footsteps of the general Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). Nabi ρ had made an explicit bequest in this regard. How is it possible for Hadhrat Shah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) to ever act in contrary to the Path shown in *Khairul Quroon*?

Secondly, Hadhrat Shah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh), in *Izaalatul Khufa* mentioned this in the context of explaining the Khilaafat which was in accordance with the Nubuwwat. He was explaining that the perfect examples of Khilaafat and administration lasted upto the era of Hadhrat Uthmaan **τ. He most certainly did not mean that the era of goodness itself ended with the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthmaan τ.** There is no doubt that the goodness which was in the first era was not the same as in the second

and likewise the third. Notwithstanding this, the third era was nevertheless part of the *Khairul Quroon*.

Thirdly, if we have to assume that Hadhrat Shah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) did in fact mean that the *Khairul Quroon* ended with the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthmaan τ, then too this does not exclude the compulsion for us to follow that rest of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim), or that we accept their Path as a means of salvation. Hadhrat Shah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) himself states as follows, *"I say that the Firqatun Naajia (successful sect) is that one which follows those beliefs and practices expounded in The Kitaab and Sunnah; and upon which were the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen...**and the unsuccessful sects are those whose beliefs are contrary to that of the Salf and their actions are contrary as well."*** **[Hujjatullahil Baalighah, vol. 1, page 170]**

Peruse this text over and over again and you will see that Hadhrat Shah Saheb regards the Path followed by the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) as being the Path of Success. He further explains that any belief and/or action which is contrary to theirs leads to deviation.

At another juncture he states regarding the *Firqatun Naajia* and Ahle Haqq, *"These personalities had diligently followed the Ahaadith of Nabi ρ and the Aathaar of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) and Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen."* [Hujjatullahil Baalighah, vol. 1, page 149]

Amongst the famous Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen was **Hadhrat Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 150 A.H], who was a Tabiee.** Other famous among the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen included Imaams

Maalik, Shaafi` (rahmatullah alayhim), etc., who were amongst the Tabe Tabieen. In short, Hadhrat Shah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) considered the Path of Success as being found in following the ways of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). Any opposition to them and their ways leads to deviation. All this clearly proves that it is the view of Hadhrat Shah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) that it is necessary to follow not only the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen but also the rest of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen, etc. He is also of the view that success and salvation is limited to this Path.

Note

In differentiating between Sunnat and bid'ah, some have constrained the definition of *Khairul Quroon* to be whatever has not been established from the beliefs and actions of Nabi ρ, some Sheikhein, some Khulafa-e-Raashideen. Others have limited *Khairul Quroon* to be the era of the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen. This does not in any way limit the *Khairul Quroon*. All these limitations have been stated merely in accordance to the needs of the writers at that time. **Mentioning of one does not necessarily exclude the others.** And as for those who have defined in toto the *Khairul Quroon* and described bid'ah to be whatever does not conform to the actions, beliefs and ways of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim), have basically summarized and incorporated all the others (who have only mentioned parts of the *Khairul Quroon*).

By not understanding this principle, Molvi Abdus Samee Saheb in *Anwaarus Saat`ia,* Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan Saheb in *Jaa-al Haq*, and other like-thinking bid'ah-lovers have in their respective writings misled the masses.

Islaamic Fiqh and Qiyaas are also Shar`i proofs

Nabi ρ was well aware of the fact that the needs and environment of mankind are not stagnant and evolutionary. The needs and situations of man have to adapt to the surrounding changes. It was for this reason that he ρ did not issue rulings on numerous occasions and did not deem it appropriate to do so. He left these matters to the discretion and understanding of those who believed in Allaah Ta'ala, His Rasul ρ and the Last Day. He left it to them to base their rulings on the principles outlined in the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnat. Those who adhere strictly to the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnah will deduce what is Haqq. They will most certainly find the Haqq and correct Path in their *ijtihaad*, when they use the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnah as their guide. This is called *fiqh* or *Qiyaas*. A Mujtahid can be either correct or in error.

However, if the Mujtahid had utilised his total efforts and applied his judgement to the best of his ability and research, then he will not be sinning if he errs, he will in fact, be rewarded. In this regard, Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar and Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ report, ***"Rasulullaah ρ said, 'If a Haakim (one who makes a ruling) issues a ruling based on ijtihaad, and he is correct, then he will receive double reward, and if a Haakim makes ijtihaad and errs, then he will receive one reward."*** [Bukhaari Shareef, vol. 2, page 1092 / Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 76 / Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 2, page 324]

The reason being that Allaah Ta`ala does not let the sincere effort of any *bandah* go to waste. Whatever time and effort the Mujtahid expands in his Ijtihaad is duly reward by Allaah Ta`ala. When he deduces a correct ijtihaad, then he is rewarded for his effort and for being accurate. However, the condition is that the Mujtahid must in the true and real

sense *be* a Mujtahid, otherwise the other Hadith will apply wherein Nabi ρ states that the **ruling of an ignoramus only leads him to The Fire of Jahannum** [Abu Dawood, Ibn Maajah and Mishkaat, vol. 2, page 324]

This Hadith clearly states that the ijtihaad of a Mujtahid earns him reward regardless of his outcome. Let us take a look at the narration of Hadhrat Ma`aaz bin Jabal τ [passed away 18 A.H.], as a further confirmation and testification. On the occasion when Nabi ρ was sending him off to Yemen, as the governor, he ρ asked him, *"How will you rule on any matter which presents itself to you?"* He replied, *"I will rule in accordance to the Kitaabullaah."* Nabi ρ asked, *"What if you do not find (an answer) in the Kitaabullaah?"* He replied, *"Then (I will seek it) in the Sunnah of Rasulullaah ρ."* Nabi ρ asked, *"What if you do not find it in the Sunnah of Rasulullaah ρ?"* He replied, *"I will then rule according to my opinion."* Nabi ρ then placed his blessed hand on his (Hadhrat Ma`aaz's - radhiallahu anhu) chest and exclaimed, *"All praise to that Being Who has blessed his Rasul's messenger with the taufeeq, wherewith His Rasul is pleased."* [Mishkaat, vol. 2, page 324]

Haafidh Imaaduddeen ibn Katheer (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 774 .H.], states after reporting this Hadith, *"The isnaad (chain of narrators) of this narration are reliable and dependable."* [Tafseer, vol. 1, page 3]

In this narration, Nabi ρ praised and expressed *shukr* unto Allaah Ta`ala for the statement of Hadhrat Ma`aaz τ that he will use his opinion (i.e. make *Qiyaas*) on any matter which he cannot find a solution to in the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnah.

This proves that Nabi ρ did not restrict the Ummat to established rules and laws, so that if any matter presents itself to the Ummat, right until Qiyaamah, which is not found clearly in the Qur`aan Majeed or Sunnah then they will not be stuck or at a loss. Whenever any matter presented itself before **Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ** [passed away 13 A.H.], then he would seek its solution in the Qur`aan Majeed or Sunnah of Rasulullaah ρ. If he did not find the solution therein, then he would make ijtihaad.

*"Indeed when Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ was faced with any matter (to be ruled on) and he did not find for it (a solution) in the Kitaabullah or in the Sunnat of Rasulullaah ρ, then he would say, **'I make ijtihaad** with my opinion, if it is correct then it is from Allaah Ta`ala and if in error, then it is from myself and I seek forgiveness from Allaah Ta`ala.'"* [Tabqaat Ibn As`ad, vol.3, page 136]

Hadhrat Umar τ wrote to the **famous Tabiee, Qaadhi Shuraih (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 85 A.H]** advising him to practice ijtihaad after exhausting all avenues in the Qur`aan Majeed, Sunnat and Ijma. [See Masnad Daarmi, page 34 and Kanzul `Ummaal, vol.3, page 174]

Similarly Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood also advised making Qiyaas and ijtihaad after Ijma [Masnad Daarmi, page 34]. This was the practice of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Abbaas τ that when he found no solution in the Kitaabullah, Sunnah or Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar τ, then he would say, *"This is from my opinion."* [Masnad Daarmi, page 33 / Mustadrak, vol.1, page 130]

In summary the majority Ahle Islaam have accepted Shar`i Qiyaas as a proof in the Shariah. In this regard Nawaab Siddique Hasan Khaan Saheb states, *"The majority*

Sahaabah τ, Tabieen, Fuqaha and Mutakallimeen are of the view that Shar`i Qiyaas is a principle from amongst the principles of the Shariah. The extraction of rulings by using it as proof is in order. However, the Ahle Zaahir have refuted the concept of Qiyaas." [Ifaada Ash-Shuyookh, page 122]

The Ahle Zaahir labour under this misconception that a non-Nabi does not have the authority to proffer his opinion (Qiyaas). On the face of it, their objection appears logical and fair, however it is far from the reality. The rulings deduced by ijtihaad and Qiyaas are in reality extracted from the Qur`aan Majeed, Ahaadith etc. It is merely the interpretation of all these sources. **It is the task of Mujtahid to extract rulings for issues regarding which the Shariah is silent.** He merely constructs a solution by bringing together the sources of the Shariah. The famous Islaamic philosopher, Allaamah Ibn Rushd Abul Waleed Muhammed bin Ahmed (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 595 A.H] writes, ***"As for Shar`i Qiyaas, it is the application of a Waajib ruling established in the Shariah of one thing to another, where both have a common "illat" (causative factor)."*** [Hidaayatul Mujtahid, vol.1, page 3]

Nawaab Saheb interprets this thus, *"When any person cannot find clarity of a mas`alah in the Qur`aan Majeed or Hadith, then he will make ijtihaad and istimbaat from Qur`aan Majeed and Hadith. This ijtihaad and istimbaat will not be regarded as being isolated or different from Qur`aan Majeed or Hadith. Similar is that statement of a Sahaabi τ which is of the category of ijtihaad or istimbaat, it will not be regarded as being divergent from Qur`aan Majeed and Hadith. In fact, it will be regarded as being part of Qur`aan Majeed and Hadith."* [Risaalat Ahle Hadith, page 7]

He states further, *“This doubt remains (on the assumption that we accept the view of the Sahaabah τ) that there is a third thing after the Qur`aan Majeed and Hadith insofar as proof in the Shariah, whereas there is no such third thing (which can be a proof in the Shariah), just as our Ijtihaad cannot be the third thing [page 2]…”*

Moulana Maududi Saheb writes, *“As for that person who has not as yet attained the mantle of Ijtihaad, he will find safety if he follows the research and views of the Aimmah of the various Shar`i sciences. As in all the fields of worldly sciences and knowledge, the knowledge of the Deen is also acquired in this way (i.e. following the learned seniors). Those who abandon this path and make Ijtihaad without having the knowledge and qualifications to do so, only carry the load of disgrace and dishonour for themselves.”* [Tafheemaat, page 286]

If only Moulana Maududi had benefited from his own salient advice! Had he only abandoned his own research and Ijtihaad, which not only led him to dishonour and disgrace, but he would have also saved many others from misguidance.

The Qiyaas of the Pious and abstemious

As has already been established, there are a few necessary conditions for (qualification of) Ijtihaad, which if not found cannot be cited as a proof in the Shariah. **Similarly, even the statements and views of the Sufis cannot be cited as Shar`i proof, unless of course, it is in conformity with the Shariah.** Allaamah Qaadhi Ebrahim Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away ± 1000 A.H.] writes, *“That `Aabid and Zaahid who is not from the Ahle Ijtihaad, is included amongst the masses. His view is of no*

consequence (as a Shar`i proof). However, if his view and statement is in conformity with the Shar`i principles (Usools) and reliable Kitaabs, then it will be taken into consideration." [Nafaaisul Izhaar Tarjuma Majaalisul Abraar, page 127]

Note: Mullah Kaatib Chalpi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1067 A.H.] has made this error of saying that *Majaalisul Abraar* is the work of Mullah Ahmad Rumi (rahmatullah alayh). Such errors are many from him. [For example, look at *Fawaahid Bahiya*, page 19 and at the footnote *Ta`liqaat Sunniya*, page 180]

Shah Abdul Azeez Saheb Muhaddith Dehlwi (rahmatullah alayh) has also praised Majaalisul Abraar. He would say that the Kitaab is *"Reliable and reputable."* [Fataawa Azeezi, vol. 2, page 115]

Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) had made the following salient comment, *"**The views of the Sufiya Kiraam have no reputability in matters of Halaal and Haraam.** It is however appropriate that we not chastise them, and leave their matter unto Allaah Ta`ala. In such matters, we consider the views of Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf and Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayhim), and not that of Sufiya such as, Abu Bakr Shibli and Abu Hasan Noori (rahmatullah alayhim)."* [Maktoobaat, vol. 1, page 335 / Maktoob, page 266]

Qiyaas is not bid'ah

We have already earlier established with proof that *Qiyaas* and *ijtihaad* are not any different from Qur`aan Majeed and Hadith (insofar as their being valid proofs in the Shariah are concerned). In fact, it is the link between *ghair-mansoos* and *mansoos*. This is also a valid Shar`i

proof. Neither does *Qiyaas* and *ijtihaad* add or subtract anything from the Deen, therefore it can never be labelled as a bid'ah. Imaam Abu Is`haq Shaatbi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 790 A.H.] writes, *"It is far from the honour of the Ulama to label the corollary (masaa`il), that were not prevalent in earlier times, which are deduced (by Qiyaas), as a bid'ah. Even though their masaa`il are not very in-depth. Similarly it is not correct to label the intricacies of the external and internal character analysis as a bid'ah, because all these matters are derived from the principles of the Shariah."* [Al-I`tisaam, vol. 1, page 275]

At another juncture he states, *"As for the discussion on the intricacies of Tasawwuf, this is not bid'ah."* [vol. 1, page 274]

From this we establish that the reliable and notable scholars of the Deen do not consider the exercises and actions of purification of the heart (Tasawwuf) as a bid'ah, because all this is established from the principles of the Shariah. Contrary to bid'ahs, which are not based, derived or proven from reliable Shar`i principles. These are mere views from the whims and fancies of the Ahle Bid'ah. *"That is what their mouths spew forth."*

It is indeed surprising that Molvi Abdus Samee Saheb writes, *"Surprising is the actions of those who bring into practice the exercises and actions of the Sufiya and Mashaaikh and they deem Taqleed-e-Shakhsi as being compulsory by limiting it (Taqleed) to the four Imaams and they authenticate and regard as correct Ijma of the Ummat, and then they express the view that whatever was innovated after the three (early Islaamic) eras is bid'ah of deviation and leads to The Fire."* [Anwaarus Saat`ia, page 42]

He does not even understand the import and meaning of *Khairul Quroon*, but this discussion has passed previously. There is no need for a repetition. It is not known which *Muhaqqiq* Aalim has ever claimed that the Haqq is only restricted to the four Imaams, and that whosoever does not follow any one of them will most certainly be on baatil. It is entirely a different matter that according to the research of Hadhrat Shah Waliullah Saheb and others whose fiqh was closest to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and they have made Taqleed binding on themselves, and that on a general scale the following of one of the four Imaams is somewhat necessary in these times, as Allamah Ibn Khuldoon (rahmatullah alayh) etc. had outlined [see Muqaddamah, page 448]. However to restrict the Haqq to Taqleed cannot be made compulsory.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb writes, *"The exercises of Tasawwuf and the innovations of the Sufiya change with every changing era/generation, and they are all permissible. In fact, the Path of Sulook was initiated by them. Say now, where is that rule that every new thing is Haraam?"* [Jaa-al Haqq wa Zahaqal Baatil, page 214]

The ruling is on its place, but this is a short-sightedness on the part of this Mufti Saheb. We have just now cited from *Al-I`tisaam* that the intricacies of Tasawwuf are not bid'ah because they are all sourced from the Principles of the Shariah. These are not the mere views and whims of the Sufiya-e-Kiraam (rahmatullah alayhim), which we need to discount as their short-comings. Yes, it is entirely a different matter if the Sufi is well-versed in the external knowledge, an Aalim of the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnah, and a paragon of piety and steadfast on the Sunnat. **Every Sufi is not really worthy of the title of 'Sufi'.**

We have strayed from the actual discussion. The actual point under discussion is that *Qiyaas* is not a bid'ah. Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"However, Qiyaas and ijtihaad are not bid'ah and have no connection to it,* ***because Qiyaas clarifies and makes clear the nusoos meaning,*** *and is not the invention of any zaahid."* [Maktoob, part 3, vol. 74]

Summary

Keeping in mind the afore-going discussion, this is made as crystal clear as daylight that there are four sources of proofs in the Shariah – Kitaabullaah, Sunnat-e-Rasulullaah ρ, *Ijma* and *Qiyaas*. It has also been established that *Qiyaas* is a valid Shar`i proof and not a bid'ah. Since *Qiyaas* and *ijtihaad* are valid in the Shariah, how will it then be correct to aver that making Taqleed of a Mujtahid is a bid'ah? We will now weigh every statement and action of ours on their scale. If it conforms, then it is Haqq and therein lies success and salvation. If it conflicts and differs, then it is baatil and rejected. As stated in the words of Allamah Iqbal [passed away 1357 A.H.]:

"Pick it up and chuck it far into the gutters."

A salient and significant discussion regarding Qiyaas

It is an accepted fact that this Deen was perfected during the era and lifetime of Nabi ρ. **The meaning of perfection of the Deen is that the rules, laws and principles of the Deen were completed.** Any new occurrence or issue had to be levelled and deduced using these principles and laws, which is called *Qiyaas* and *ijtihaad*. However, it does

occur sometimes that, because of some factor or the other, the real solution may be hidden for the Mujtahid. This is what has led to some differences of opinion between the Fuqahaa. In such instances, that which is closest to the Haqq is accepted and practiced upon, and deemed as being the path to salvation. **Yes, if there is a solution in the Qur`aan Majeed or Sunnah, or if one is apprised of an *Ijma* on that issue, then *Qiyaas* will not be undertaken.** Those masaa`il and rulings upon which the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam had made *ijtihaad* or *Qiyaas*, their respective principles and laws of deduction were present during the time of Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim), however the reasons for deduction and causative factors were not prevalent or needed at the time.

These factors came into being during the later eras, which gave rise to the Fuqahaa having to make *ijtihaad* and *Qiyaas*. When the Fuqahaa discerned the need to make *Qiyaas*, they did so, thereby uniting the *nusoos* and principles of the Shariah to formulate the solutions. Contrary to the severe bid'ahs which are prevalent nowadays, and which are practiced by the stalwarts of bid'ah (to such an extant that they insist on them as being necessaries of Deen, and they label the non-participants as *wahabis* and Allaah Ta`ala knows best what, what epithets they hurl). The causative factors and reasons for practice of all these bid'ahs (of present time) were present during the era of the *Khairul Quroon*, but these accretions to the Deen were never initiated during those noble eras. Therefore to include the initiation of *meelaad,* etc. as part of *Qiyaas* is clear ignorance and stupidity. **That is, the reason for having *meelaad* (celebrating the birth of Nabi ρ was present during the era of *Khairul Quroon*.** Forty years prior to Nubuwwat and 23 years thereafter, then during the era of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen

(rahmatullah alayhim) there was occasion to celebrate the birth of Nabi ρ, since the personalities of those eras had intense love for Nabi ρ, but none of them ever celebrated as is vogue nowadays. There is absolutely no substantiation of the customary *meelaad* during any of that time.

Since the causative factor and stimulant for holding *meelaad* was present at that time, yet it was never celebrated, makes the use of *Qiyaas* and *ijtihaad* in such matters superfluous and unnecessary.

Similarly, two blessed wives of Nabi ρ, Hadhrat Khadija and Hadhrat Zainub τ, his uncle, Sayyidush Shuhadaa Hadhrat Hamza τ, three of his children, Hadhrat Ruqayya, Umme Kulthoom and Zainub τ and others passed away during the blessed lifetime of Nabi ρ and yet he had never practiced *teeja, saatwa, daswa* or *chaaliswa* (7 days, 10 days and forty days) for any of them. He held no procession at their grave-sites, held no *urs*, never burnt lanterns at their graves, never placed *chadars* (sheets) on their graves, never placed flowers or built domes on their graves. In fact, most of these accretions, he had actually cursed (for example, he cursed the placing of lanterns at graves, etc.). What then is the logic or reasoning behind making *Qiyaas* in opposition to *nass*? Even after his ρ's demise, the Sahaabah τ, notwithstanding their intense love (*ishq*) for him, never ever executed any of these accretions in his honour. Neither did the Tabieen or Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) do any of this for the Sahaabah τ. **All the reasons for their celebrating these things were present and there was no prevention for them to do it. Yet these bid'ahs were never practiced.** *Isaal-e-Tahwaab* was made, but no food was placed at the graves or any of the other evils which prevail nowadays. Nothing

during those eras took place as does nowadays. Nikahs took place in those days as well, but not in the fashion practiced today, where garlands are tied, money is wasted, etc., etc. Janaazahs also took place in those days, but there was no loud dua, etc. at the gravesite, and all the other evils which are in vogue. Salaatul Janaazah was also performed those days, but there was no dua immediately following the completion of the Salaat. Talqeen was made at the graveside, but no loud Athaan. The deceased were also covered in *kafan* but nothing was written on their bier-cloth. Thikr and Durood-Shareef was also recited in those days, but not loudly in unison as is the practice nowadays.

Nowadays, as many Bid'ah that are customary and vogue, all of them could have existed during the Khairul Quroon (Best of eras), but none existed. Therefore, what is the reason for making Qiyaas and Ijtihaad in these matters (in order to make them permissible for our times)? This much is worth considering that if there was a necessity for making Ijtihaad and Qiyaas in these matters, then surely the Mujtahiddeen of the past would have done so. It would not have passed their attention. It is completely incomprehensible that in these matters the Mujtahiddeen did not deem it necessary to make Qiyaas or Ijtihaad in them, and today these things have become permissible. They surely had more Ishq and Muhabbit (love and affection) for Allaah Ta`ala and Nabi ρ. They excelled in knowledge and Taqwah. Their fear for Allaah Ta`ala and the Hereafter was near perfect. How is it that they did not make these things a part of the Deen? Nowadays, there seems to be a renaissance of the Deen and these things have become part of the Deen and signs of the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat.

After careful thought and consideration on this matter, one will naturally come to this conclusion that, since the

reasons and possibilities of these Bid'ah acts existed during the former times, yet they did not make Qiyaas on them, and these acts did not even reach the stage of Bid`ah-e-Hasana. There is absolutely no doubt that these acts have today reached the stage of Bid`ah-e-Qabeeha / Sayyia`. In this regard, Qaadhi Ebrahim Al-Hanafi rahmatullahi alaih) states:

"If there existed a reason (for instituting an act) during the era of Nabi ρ, but due to some temporary excuse it was omitted, and then after his ρ's demise when this (temporary) excuse was removed, then it would be permissible to initiate such an act. For example, the compilation of the Qur`aan-e-Kareem. This was not possible during the life of Nabi ρ because the Wahi was being revealed continuously. Whatever Allaah Ta`ala desired to change, He would change. After the demise of Nabi ρ this restraint was removed. If there existed any reason for instituting an act during the era of Nabi ρ and it could have been carried out without any restraint, but it was not carried out, then even after the demise of Nabi ρ such acts cannot be instituted. This would be to change the Deen. If such acts were beneficial, then surely, Nabi ρ would have instituted them or at least encouraged towards them. But since, Nabi ρ did not carry out these acts himself, nor did he encourage towards them, therefore it stands to reason that such acts are devoid of any benefits. In fact it would be classified as Bid`ah-e-Sayyi`a."
[Nafaa`isul Azhaar, Tarjuma Majaalisul Abraar, page 127]

This text is very clear and definite proof that if during the era of Nabi ρ there existed no impediment to carrying out an act, and Nabi ρ himself did not execute the act nor did he encourage towards it, it will be classified as a Bid'ah-e-Sayyia`. Even though externally these acts appear as being

virtuous acts of Ibaadat. In this connection, Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ states:

"Follow in our footsteps, and do not innovate (new things). Indeed, you have been sufficed." [Al-I`tisaam, page 54, vol.1]

Hadhrat Huzaifah τ states:

"Do not make any Ibaadat that the Sahaabah of Rasulullaah ρ did not do!" [Al-I`tisaam, page 113, vol.1]
Haafidh Ibn Katheer (rahmatullahi alaih) stated:

"The Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat states that it is a Bid'ah to carry out whatever act and statement is not established from Rasulullaah ρ by the Sahaabah τ. Because if that act was a good one, then the Sahaabah would most definitely have carried it out first. Indeed if an act was a good one, then they would have surpassed us in it. They never left out any virtuous act from the virtuous acts, except that they would excel us in it." [Tafseer Ibn Katheer, page 156, vol.4]

In conclusion, the Qiyaas and Ijtihaad of a Mujtahid is True and Haqq. But, this applies only to those acts whose reasons and possibilities became prevalent after the era of Nabi ρ. **Qiyaas and Ijtihaad is definitely not permissible and valid for any act whose reasons, possibilities and need existed during the era of Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah.** Nowadays, almost all the Bid`ahs that are prevalent are acts whose reasons and possibilities existed during the era of Nabi ρ. In such acts there is only success and benefit in following the footsteps of these illustrious personalities. By opposing them and acting contrary to their actions brings only the Anger of Allaah Ta`ala. Nabi ρ will also definitely not be pleased. The Ishq and

Muhabbit of the Sahaabah and Taabieen was limited to only this. Contrary to this way is deviation and Bid'ah. Destruction in the Hereafter and annihilation is in this (contradiction).

CHAPTER TWO:

The lexicographic and Shar`i definition of Bid`ah and the different types and its explanation

After Shirk (polytheism), Nabi ρ did not condemn any other thing more than he did of Bid'ah and the Ahle Bid'ah. This is the reality that Bid'ah, changes the pattern and principles of Deen. Thereafter there remains no differentiation between original and fake, Haqq and baatil. The Qur`aan-e-Hakeem spells out clearly that in principle there are two ways in which the Deen is destroyed; (1). Suppressing the Haqq and (2). Mixing of Haqq and baatil. It is in this mixing and entangling of the Haqq and baatil that people replace the Deen of Allaah Ta`ala with their own whims and desires. Every person makes a part of the Deen whatever his desires dictate to him, and he excludes from the Deen whatever he wishes. It will no longer remain the Deen of Allaah Ta`ala, rather it will become a child's play (Nauthubillah!).

This point must also be kept in mind that the decision of whether any act is deserving of Thawaab (reward) or worthy of Athaab (punishment), is exclusively that of

Allaah Ta`ala. The duty of reaching this information to the people and the masses was that of Nabi ρ. For a person to make a thing worthy of Thawaab or Athaab, according to his wishes, is like as though he is doing the work of Divinity (Nauthubillah!). Allaah Ta`ala had made Nabi ρ an excellent and perfect example for us to follow. He had also given us the Command to follow him. He did not leave us to follow our own whims and fancies. In this regard Allaah Ta`ala says:

"Indeed for you in Rasulullaah is an excellent example, for that person who desires Allaah and the Aakhiraat (Hereafter) and who remembers Allaah abundantly."
[Surah Ahzaab, Para 21, Ruku 2)

In this Aayat, Allaah Ta`ala had made the perfect human, Nabi ρ, the perfect example for us to follow. He has advised us that peace and success in every sphere of our lives lies in following him and by following in his footsteps, we will save ourselves from all types of worries and grieves.

In another Aayat, Allaah Ta`ala says:

"Say (O Nabi - ρ)! If you love Allaah, then follow me, (then) Allaah will love you and He will forgive you your sins." [Surah Aale Imraan, Para 3, Ruku 4]

This Aayat is clear proof that if any person or group today, claims to love their Creator, then it is imperative that they follow in the footsteps of Nabi ρ.

Sunnat is the name of this following of Nabi's ρ excellent example, guidance and history. Bid'ah is the opposite of this.

Hadhrat Jaabir Bin Abdillah τ says that Nabi ρ mentioned in a loud voice at a Jumuah gathering, in the presence of thousands of people:

"Amma Ba`ad! Indeed the best of Speech is the Kitaab of Allaah! And the best of Hadya (Example and Guide) is the Hadya of Muhammedur Rasulullaah. The worst of things is innovations and every Bid'ah is deviation."
[Muslim, page 285, vol.1 / Mishkaat, page 27, vol.1]

In this Hadith, Nabi ρ mentioned his Guidance and Seerat (teachings) in opposition to Bid'ah, and he made this very clear that whatever is innovated that is contrary to his Seerat, is Bid'ah and that every Bid'ah is deviation. Here also we learn that every innovation is not necessarily evil, otherwise the worldly inventions would also fall in this category. **In fact only those innovations are evil that are contrary to the teachings of the Kitaabullaah and Nabi ρ.** Therefore those things that are not contrary to the teachings of the Qur`aan and Sunnah are not necessarily evil innovations and deviation. Allaah Ta`ala is not pleased with deviation, it for this reason that he sent so many Ambiyaa and Kitaabs and Scriptures in order to combat deviation. In this narration stated in Nisai, the following words also appear:

"And all deviation is in The Fire." [Nisai, page 179, vol.1]

It is for this reason that Rasulullaah ρ said that the Ahle Bid'ah are deserving of the curse of the entire universe. He prevented from rendering their praises and honouring them. He used to say that all their Ibaadat is useless, until such a time that they refrain from their Bid'ah. He also used to say that the Ahle Bid'ah are deprived from making

Tawbah. May Allaah Ta`ala save us from this and from all other types of sin.

Hadhrat Ali τ reports that Nabi ρ said:

"Madinah is Haram (sanctified) from (the place) 'Ayr' to (the place) 'Thaur'. Hence whoever innovates anything (in the Deen) in between these places, or grants refuge to an innovator (Bid`ati), then upon him is the curse of Allaah, His Angels and the entire mankind. No 'Sarf 'or 'Adl' (Fardh or Nafl Ibaadat) will be accepted from him." [Mishkaat, page 238, vol.1 / Bukhaari, page 1084, vol. 2 / Muslim, page 144, vol.1]

In this Hadith the limits of the Haram for Madinah are only mentioned as a form of warning and reprimand, it is NOT as a reservation or limited, in that Bid'ah is only evil and bad in Madinah and not outside! That thing which is evil and a Bid'ah will be so in all places and times. **Yes, the evil and sin of a Bid'ah will be intensified owing to the honour of a place or sanctity of the time.** What can be a more severe statement and warning for the dishonour and disgrace of the Bid`ati than the words which emanated from the blessed lips of Nabi ρ ? These narrations are sufficient to show the abomination and evil of Bid'ah. We will mention a few more narrations merely as further testification and for perusal:

"Hadhrat Abdullaah Bin Abbaas τ reports from Nabi ρ: 'Allaah has refused to accept the deeds of a Bid`ati, until he refrains from his Bid'ah.'" [Ibn Majah, page 6]

Hadhrat Ali τ reports:

"Whoever innovates anything in it (Madinah Shareef) or he grants refuge to a Bid`ati, upon him is the curse of

Allaah, His angels and all of mankind. Neither will 'Sarf' or 'Adl' (Nafl or Fardh acts) be accepted from him." [Bukhaari, page 251, vol.1]

Bid'ah, wherever it occurs is still a Bid'ah. However, if it is perpetrated in Madinah, which is a sanctified place, then the gravity of the act is much worse and the sin will be greater.

Hadhrat Ebrahim Bin Maisara (rahmatullahi alaih) reports that Rasulullaah ρ said:

"Whoever grants respect and honour to a Bid`ati, indeed he has aided in the destruction of Islaam." [Mishkaat, page 31, vol. 1]

It is for this reason that the Sahaabah had a great deal of dislike for Bid'ah. Once someone brought the salaams of another person to Hadhrat Abdullaah Bin Umar τ, who commented:

"It has reached me that this person (who sent the salaams) has innovated something in the Deen. If indeed (this is true and) he has innovated (something in the Deen), then do not convey my salaams to him." [Tirmidhi, page 38, vol.2 / Daarmi, page 59 / Abu Dawood, page 278, vol.2 / Ibn Majah, page 304 / Mishkaat, page 23, vol.1]

Hadhrat Ibn Mas`ood τ states:

"To be moderate in a Sunnat is better than to strive in a Bid'ah." [Mustadrak, page 103, vol. 1]

Hadhrat Anas Bin Maalik τ reports that Rasulullaah ρ said:

***"Indeed Allaah has closed all the doors of Tawbah for the Bid`ati."*** [Majma`us Zawaahid, page 189, vol.1]

From these narrations we note that Bid'ah is such an evil and detestable thing that any sensible person would to whatever he can in his ability to combat it. An effect of it is that it prevents one from seeking repentance from Allaah Ta`ala. From a logical point of view this also makes sense that if a person carries out a Bid'ah act and he deems it worthy of Thawaab, then why will he make Tawbah for it? Tawbah is made for sins and evil and not for 'good' acts. Nobody performs Salaat and keeps fast and thereafter says: *"O Allaah! Forgive my Salaat and fast."*

A Bid`ati has closed the doors of Tawbah upon himself by his thinking that his act is worthy of reward.

Hadhrat Aisha τ reports that Rasulullaah ρ said:

"Whoever innovates in this matter of ours(the Deen), that which is not in it, indeed it is rejected." [Bukhaari, page 371, vol.1 / Muslim, page 77, vol.2 / Abu Dawood, page 279, vol.2 / Ibn Majah, page 3]

It is important that we clarify and explain the words ***"in this matter of ours"***, so that there is no misunderstanding. Haafidh Ibn Rajab Hambali (rahmatullahi alaih) states:

"All those things that a person innovates into the Deen, which Allaah and His Rasul has not given permission to, does not have any part of the Deen." [Jaamiul Uloom Wal Hakam, page 42]

He intended saying that not all innovations are rejected, **only those that have something to do with the Deen.** He

also states that in some narrations the word ‘Deen’ appears in the place of “in this matter of ours”:

“And in the words of some of the narrations, it appears: ***‘He who innovates in this Deen of ours, which is not from it, indeed it is rejected’****”*. [page 42]

If in some narrations made by the blessed tongue of Nabi ρ the words ***“this Deen of ours”*** comes in place of ***“In this matter of ours”***, what further clarification is needed?

Haafidh Ibn Hajar (rahmatullahi alaih) mentions regarding ***“In this matter of ours”***:

“It means: The matter of Deen” [Fathul Baari, page 321, vol.5]

That is, whoever innovates any new thing in this Deen of ours, it is rejected.

Allaamah Taftaazaani (rahmatullahi alaih) writes:

“Indeed this (sentence) means whoever makes in the Deen whatever is not part of it......” [Sharhul Maqaasid, page 271, vol.2]

Allaamah Azeezi (rahmatullahi alaih) states:

“Whoever innovates in this matter of ours, that is, in the Deen of Islaam.” [As-Siraajul Muneer, page 320, vol.3]

From all these citations, this much is very clear that not all innovations are evil and rejected. **Only those innovations which are deemed as part of the Deen or are left out of the Deen.** This is not only restricted to the commentaries of the commentators of Hadith, but according to Ibn Rajab,

it is actually the words that appears in some narrations. These narrations are proof that whatever innovations in the Deen the people have initiated, all of them are rejected and evil.

Hence, Moulana Kharram Ali Saheb Hanafi, translator of ‘Mushaariqil Anwaar’ writes:

“As many Bid`ahs the people have innovated that are contrary to the Shariah, according to this Hadith, are all rejected. There is no need to elaborate on the issue. For example, to build around the graves, to put a dome there, to illuminate it, to make Ta`ziyah, to celebrate the occasions of the pious people, to make “minnats” by using the names of the Auliyaa, to place flags as signs, etc. - all such actions are completely contrary to the Shariah. There is no basis for them in the Qur`aan, Sunnah, Ijma` or Qiyaas.” [Page. 10]

The Akaabireen Ulama of Deoband

From this Hadith (quoted above), even the Ulama of the Deoband have understood the words ***“in this matter of ours”***, to mean ‘The Deen’. Hadhrat Moulana Khaleel Ahmed Sahaaranpuri (rahmatullahi alaih) writes: *“The words ‘Fi Amrina Haza’ refers to the Deen.”* [Bazlool Majhood, page 195]

Hadhrat Sheikhul Islaam Moulana Shabbir Ahmed Uthmaani (rahmatullahi alaih) writes:

“The meaning of ‘Amrid deen’ is as the Ulama have stated and explained.” [Fathul Mulhim, page 407, vol.2]

The belief of the Ulama of the Barelwi

The Tafseer of this Hadith has also been interpreted as "Amr-e-Deen", by the Barelwi Ulama. A famous Barelwi Aalim, Molvi Mohammed Saalih Saheb writes: *"The meaning of the word 'Amr' (in the Hadith) is Amr-e-Deen. The object is this that the matters of Deen, be they Ibadaat or Muaamalaat (dealings), which the Shariah has specified and clarified, to add to or subtract from them is a rejected act."* [Tuhfatul Ahbaab fi Tahqeeq Ithaal-e-Thawaab, page 117]

Molvi Abdus Samee' Saheb Raam Puri writes: *"This Hadith is from the Saheehain. That is, whoever has taken into the Deen, such things which are not a part of the Deen, i.e. it is contrary to Qur`aan and Sunnah -- such things are rejected."* [Anwaar-e-Saati`a, page 33]

The leader of the opposite party, (their) Mujaddid-e-Millat A`la Hadhrat Molvi Ahmed Raza Khan Saheb Barelwi writes, in trying to legalise (make Halaal) tobacco : *"Remains (this contention) that it is a Bid'ah. This is not a harmful thing that there is Bid'ah in food and drink. This is not part of the Deen. Therefore to classify it as Haraam will be a difficult task."* [Ahkaam-e-Shariah, vol.3, page 168]

Now you have heard it from the leader of the opposition, that Bid'ah are those rejected actions which are done whilst understanding them to be a part of the Deen. Those things which are not a part of (or connected to) the Deen, to classify them as Haraam will be a difficult task.

The definition of Bid`ah according to the Ulama of Lexicography

The respected readers have reached this conclusion that whatever is not authenticated from the Qur`aan, Hadith,

Ijma or Shar`i Qiyaas, or the action is contrary to the example set by Nabi-e-Kareem ρ's lifestyle and exemplar, and such actions are introduced into the Deen, then such actions are certainly classified as Bid'ah.

Now you should take cognisance of the definition of Bid'ah as made by the Ulama of lexicography:

The famous Imaam of lexicography, Abul Fatah Naasir Ibn Abdus Sayed Mutraazi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) writes:

"Al-Bid'ah is a noun which is derived from the word 'Ibtidaa`-ul -Amr', when an act is innovated or initiated. Just like the word 'Ar-Raf`at' which is derived from the word 'Irtifaa`', and also the word 'Khalfat' which is derived from the word 'Ikhtilaaf'. But now (the word 'Bid'ah') has been taken to mean anything which adds or subtracts from the matters of Deen." [Maghrib, vol.1, page 30]

Allaamah Fairuz Abaadi (rahmatullahi alaih) writes:

"Bid'ah, with a kasrah on the baa, (means) innovation in Deen after it has been perfected. Or it refers to those actions or desires which were innovated (into the Deen) after the demise of Nabi ρ." [Qaamoos, page 4, vol.2]

Imaam Raaghib Asfahaani (rahmatullahi alaih) writes:

"Bid'ah in the Math-hab is a word used for those actions and speech which are not in conformity with the Shariah, its example and principles." [Mufradaatul Qur`aan, page 37]

Imaam Muhammad Bin Abi Bakr Bin Abdil Qaadir Raazi, writes:

"Al-Bid'ah - innovation in the Deen after its perfection."
[Mukhtaarus Sihaah, page 280]

Allaamah Abul Fadhl Muhammad Bin Umar Jamaal Al-Qurashi (rahmatullahi alaih) writes:

"Bid'ah are those new and innovated actions and customs which are introduced into the Deen after its perfection."
[Siraah, vol.2, page 301]

The famous Urdu dictionary, 'Fairoozul Looghaat', states:
"1: Bid'ah: To innovate a new action or custom into the Deen. A new way, mode or culture. 2: Hardness, oppression. 3. To fight, cause corruption, evil." [page 194]

"Al-Bid'ah: To innovate a thing without an example. A new custom in the Deen. Such beliefs or actions whose source is not found in the first three eras, which were classified as being the best." [Misbaahul Lughaat, page 27]

Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullahi alaih) states the literal definition of Bid'ah as follows:

"Any such action which is innovated without having a former base."

The Shar`i meaning of Bid`ah

Haafidh Badruddeen Aini Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) states:

"Al-Bid'ah are actually innovations of actions which were not prevalent during the time of Rasulullaah ρ." [Umdatul Qaari, page 356, vol. 5]

Haafidh Ibn Hajar (rahmatullahi alaih) states:

"Bid'ah actually refers to those actions which are innovated without them having a previous example. According to the Shariah it is referred to as the opposite of the Sunnah, which is rejected." [Fathul Baari, page 219, vol. 4]

Allaamah Murtadha Zubaidi Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) states:

"(The meaning of the Hadith) 'All innovations are Bid'ah' refers to all those things which are contrary to the principals of the Shariah and are not in conformity with the Sunnah." [Taajul Uroos, vol. 5, page 271]

Haafidh Ibn Rajab (rahmatullahi alaih) states:

"The object of (the word) Bid'ah is all those things which are innovated and they have no source in the Shariah which can prove them. However those things (innovations) which have some source in the Shariah, which can prove them, they are not regarded as 'Bid'ah' although they will be termed as 'Bid'ah' according to the literal definition." [Jaamiul Uloom wal Hikam, page 193]

Allaamah Mu`een Bin Safi (rahmatullahi alaih) has described Bid'ah in the very same words in *"Sharah Arbaeen Nawawi"*. Haafidh Ibn Katheer states:

"The meaning of 'Badee-us-Samaawaati' is that Allaah Ta`ala ad created the heavens and the earth with His

Perfect Power without there being any previous example or model. In the dictionary, every new thing is called a Bid'ah and Bid'ah is divided into two types: (1) Bid'ah-e-Shar`i, regarding which Nabi ρ said: ***'Every new thing is a Bid'ah and every innovation (Bid'ah) is deviation.'*** *(2) Sometimes Bid'ah is literal, just like when Hadhrat Umar τ gathered the people for Taraaweeh Salaat, he said:* ***'This is a good Bid'ah.'***"

He writes further:

"And similarly, ever word and action which was not done before, is classified as a Bid'ah by the Arabs." [Tafseer, page 161]

Allaamah Abu Is`haaq Gharnaati (rahmatullahi alaihi) defines *Bid'ah-e-Shar`i* as follows:

*"This is such a method which is introduced into the Deen which is similar to the Shariah and whose following introduces excesses into the Ibaadat of Allaah Ta`ala."* [Al-I`tisaam, page 30], vol.1]

Molvi Abdus Samee` Saheb, reports that the Fuqahaa (rahmatullahi alaihim) have extracted the following meaning for *Bid`ah-e-Sayyia*, which he quotes for Allaamah Shaami (rahmatullahi alaihi) and other Muhaqqiqeen:

*"(Bid`ah is such a thing) Which is invented contrary to the Haqq that Nabi ρ had taught. Or it is such an action or condition which (whilst resembling the Shariah) appears to be a good action and it is included into the Deen and made part of the Siraatul Mustaqeem."* [Anwaarus Saati`a, page 46]

This exact same text is quoted for the definition of *Bid`ah-e-Sayyia and Bid`ah-e-Shariah* in reputable Hanafi Fiqh Kitaabs such as *Bahrur Raa`iq, Durrul Mukhtaar*, etc.

Moulana Sakhaawat Ali Saheb Al-Hanafi Jonpuri (rahmatullahi alaihi) writes:

"Bid`ah comprises all such actions, whether they be regarding Aqeedah of the Deen or harm or benefit for the Aakhirat (Hereafter), which were not authenticated or practiced by Nabi ρ or the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ."
[Risaalat Taqwa, page 9]

The famous Muhaqqiq Aalim Molvi Muhammad Saalih Saheb, from the opposition camp writes:

"The Shar`i definition of Bid`ah refers to those things which are regarded as being part of the Deen but have no Shar`i proof to back them up. Neither from the Qur`aan Majeed nor the Ahaadith, nor the Ijma` of the Mujtahiddeen nor from Qiyaas." [Tuhfatul Ahbaab, page 98]

The Akaabireen of the Ulama-e-Deoband

The Akaabireen of the Ulama of Deoband totally follow and rely on the research of the Salf-e-Saaliheen with regard to *Ittibaa-e-Sunnat*. As with other Masaa`il, they follow the definition of Bid`ah of the Salf. In this regard, Moulana Kareem Bakhsh Saheb, writes:

"According to the definition of the Shariah, Bid`ah are all such actions of the Deen which the majority of the Ahle Haqq of the first three eras have not accepted. Or it was regarded as being contrary to the Deen during these pure eras. Or it is such acts which were initiated after these

eras and they are such acts which are not necessary yet are regarded as being necessary, alternatively they are necessary acts which are not regarded as being necessary." [Haqeeqatul Imaan, page 38]

Hadhrat Moulana Shabbir Ahmad Saheb (rahmatullahi alaihi) writes:

"Bid`ah is a term referred to all such acts which are not found in the Qur`aan Majeed, Sunnat or those eras which have been testified to as being the best. It is those acts which are regarded as being part of Deen and (thought to be) liable for reward." [Hamaail Shareef, page 702]

Hadhrat Allaamah Mufti Kifaayatullaah Saheb (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

"Bid`ah are all those acts which are not established from the origins of the Shariah. That is, they are not found in the Qur`aan Majeed, the Sunnat and they were not practiced by Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ or the Taabieen (rahmatullahi alaihim). And they are such acts which are practiced or omitted regarding them to be a part of the Shariah." [Taleemul Islaam, part 4, page 27]

Beloved readers! You have ascertained from all the above discussion the strong viewpoints and concrete views of not only the Ulama of Deoband, but also those of Barelwis and other Ulama who are accepted and respected by both these groups, that Bid`ah are all those actions, beliefs or conditions which are contrary to the Qur`aan Majeed, Sunnat or Qiyaas-e-Shar`i. You have also read the text from Allaamah Ibn Katheer (rahmatullahi alaihi) that ***"All those words and actions which are not established from the Sahaabah are Bid`ah."***

Keeping all the above in mind, now reflect upon the following words of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan:

*"To stipulate the condition of it being of a Deeni nature is only from their side. This (view) is contrary to the authentic Ahaadith, statements of the Ulama and Fuqahaa and the Muhadditheen. It is stated in the Hadith: '**All innovations are Bid`ah**'. There is no conditions stated here of it (innovations) being of a Deeni or fundamental nature. Also, we have quoted the texts of Ash`atul Lam`aat and Mirqaat. There is no condition placed of it being of a Deeni nature."* [Jaa`al Haqq Wa Zahaqal Baatil, page 212]

He states further:

*"From these two texts (Ash`atul Lam`aat and Mirqaat) we neither see the condition of it being of a Deeni nature nor does it refer to the era of the Sahaabah. Whatever the act may be, whether it is of a Deeni or fundamental nature, whether it was initiated after Nabi ρ, either during the era of the Sahaabah or after them, is termed a Bid`ah."* [Jaa`al Haqq, page 206]

This claim of Mufti Saheb is based on pure ignorance, because firstly, we have cited the complete texts which define that the Shar`i Bid`ah which is accursed and rejected **does have the stipulation and condition of it being of a Deeni nature.** In fact, one narration even has the words, ***"Fi Deenina***" (in our Deen).

Secondly, even if we assume that the texts of *Ash`atul Lam`aat and Mirqaat* do not stipulate the condition of it being of a Deeni nature and it does not mention the era of the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ, this does not exclude the fact that it is mentioned in any other text. Let us show Mufti Saheb the condition of it being of a Deeni nature in

Ash`atul Lam`aat and Mirqaat. The narration of Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ where he did not reply to the Salaam of a Bid`ati was cited previously. In commentary of the words ***"Balaghani Qad Ahdatha"*** in this narration, Allaamah Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

"That is, he has innovated and started a new thing in the Deen, which is not of it." [Mirqaat, page 23, vol.1]

Sheikh Abdul Haqq Muhaddith Dehlwi (rahmatullahi alaihi) states on page 102, vol. 1 of *Ash`atul Lam`aat* that the innovations are of a Deeni nature.

There we see the condition of the innovations being of a Deeni nature coming from the texts of *Ash`atul Lam`aat and Mirqaat.* Now we need to ask Mufti Saheb, as to who is to stipulate the condition of it being of a Deeni from their side and who is contradicting the authentic Ahaadith and the statements of the Ulama, Fuqahaa and Muhadditheen? Similarly, he should refer to the commentary of these two personalities of the narrations of ***"(binding) Upon you is my Sunnat and the Sunnat of the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen"*** and ***"That upon which I am and my Companions"***. Judging from their commentaries is the actions of the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ Sunnat or Bid`ah? The text of *Ash`atul Lam`aat* has been previously mentioned that the Ijtihaad and Qiyaas of the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen are also regarded as part of the Sunnat. Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan is now clandestinely implying that the actions of the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ were also Bid`ah.

It is strange and perplexing that our Nabi ρ mentioned the actions of the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen as being Sunnat and he has made the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ a model of emulation and he has advised the Ummat to follow in their footsteps, and yet Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan states: "

either during the era of the Sahaabah or after them, is termed a Bid`ah.”

Thirdly, the statement of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan that: *“To stipulate the condition of it being of a Deeni nature is only from their side. This (view) is contrary to the authentic Ahaadith, statements of the Ulama and Fuqahaa and the Muhadditheen”* is a great slander and a blatant lie! It will not be found in the statements of any reputable Imaam, Faqeeh, Muhaddith or Aalim wherein the definition of an evil Bid`ah or a Bid`ah-e-Shar`i precludes the condition of it being of a Deeni nature.

The text from Imaam Maalik’s *Al-I`tisaam* has been quoted where he states the condition: *“Innovation in Islaam”*. The texts of other Ulama, Fuqahaa and Muhadditheen also quoted, bear similar import.

The same applies for the definitions of Bid`ah which have been quoted from the dictionaries. It has also been explained that the meaning of Nabi ρ words: ***“All innovations are Bid`ah”***, clearly indicate and imply Bid`ah-e-Shar`i in the explanation of Nabi ρ who referred to it regarding the Kitaab and Sunnat. It has also been stated whilst quoting the texts of Allaamah Ibn Katheer and Zubaidi (rahmatullahi alaihima) that it refers to Shar`i Bid`ah and not Bid`ah in the literal sense. It is now unnecessary that we quote anything further, nevertheless, for the benefit of Mufti Saheb, we will mention a few others:

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ states in commenting on the Aayat: ***“Fa Laa Taq`udu Ma`ahum…”***:

"Included under this Aayat are all those innovations in the Deen and every Bid`ah until the Day of Qiyaamah." [Khaazin, page 509, vol.1]

Mufti Saheb must now muster the courage to ask this master of Tafseer and high-ranking Sahaabi: "*Why have you added this condition of 'In the Deen' from your side? Bid`ah refers to every new thing, be it Deeni or worldly."*

Hadhrat Hassaan Taabiee (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

"No nation innovates a Bid`ah in their Deen, except that Allaah Ta`ala deprives them (removes from them) one Sunnat equal to it, whereto they will never return until the Day of Qiyaamah." [Daarmi page 26, Mishkaat, page 31]

Hadhrat Hassaan (rahmatullahi alaihi) also adds the condition of *"In their Deen"*. He compares Sunnat to Bid`ah implying that if Sunnat is a Deeni work, then Bid`ah is also a term attributed to a Deeni work. In fact, Hadhrat Ghadeef Bin Haarith reports from Nabi ρ:

"He says that Nabi ρ said: 'No nation innovates a Bid`ah, except that a Sunnat equal to it is removed from them. To hold on fast to a Sunnat is better than innovating a Bid`ah." [Masnad Ahmad, page 105, vol.4, Mishkaat, page 31]

Our Nabi ρ has also compared Sunnat to Bid`ah. If a Sunnat is a Deeni work, then Bid`ah is also a Deeni work. If Bid`ah refers to a worldly matter, as Mufti Saheb deviously avers, then this comparison would not be valid. Hence, why would a Sunnat be lifted away with the innovation of a Bid`ah?

Allaamah Sa`adud Deen Taftaazaani (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

"Indeed an accursed Bid`ah is that innovation in the Deen which was not prevalent in the era of the Sahaabah or Taabieen and it has no Shar`i proof to substantiate it." [Sharhul Maqaasid, page 271, vol.2]

Allaamah Abdul Azeez Farhaarwi (rahmatullahi alaihi), in refuting Bid`ah, states:

"It (Bid`ah) are all those things which have been innovated into the Deen after the era of the Sahaabah, without having Shar`i basis." [Bazaas, page 21]

This much becomes evidently clear that the Bid`ah which is rebuked is -- not according to Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan every new Deeni or worldly thing -- in fact, it is every innovation in the Deen. This is the Bid`ah which is Haraam. As for those Bid`ahs of things which are of a worldly nature, to establish them as being Haraam would be, in the words of Mufti Khaan Saheb Barelwi, a difficult issue.

As you note, since the time of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Abbaas τ right upto Molvi Ahmad Raza Khaan Saheb Barelwi, everyone defined a Bid`ah to be an innovation in the Deen. But Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb avers that that condition of it being of a Deeni nature is incorrect. *Subhaanallaah!*

The crux is that an accursed Bid`ah is only those things which are deemed liable for Thawaab and regarded as part of the Deen. There is consensus amongst the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ, the Taabieen and Salf-Saaliheen (rahmatullahi

alaihim) on the censuring of this. In this regard, Allaamah Shaatbi (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

*"The Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ, Taabieen, Tabe-Taabieen and other Salf-e-Saaliheen (rahmatullahi alaihim) unanimously rebuke and censure this type of Bid`ah."* [Al-I`tisaam, page 181, vol.1]

The condition of it being of a Deeni nature is present. Worldly matters are definitely not included in such Bid`ahs. In fact, this much may even be said that this (worldly matters) cannot even be classified as being Makrooh, leave alone Haraam. If you do not accept our statement, then take note of what Sheikhul Islaam, Ibn Daqeequl Eid (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

"If we consider those innovations which are of a worldly nature, then they are not equal or comparable to those innovations which are of a Deeni nature. It is as though those innovations which are related to worldly matters are not Makrooh, in fact, it can safely be claimed that many of them are not in the least bit Makrooh. When we consider those innovations which are related to corollary Deeni matters, they are not equal or comparable to those innovations which are related to principles of belief (Aqaa`id)." [Ahkaamul Ahkaam, page 51, vol.1]

Understand this text well and you will note that there are Bid`ahs in beliefs and in actions. There are Bid`ahs in worldly matters and Deeni matters. However, the innovations in worldly matters are neither Haraam nor accursed. In fact, they cannot even be classified as Makrooh. Those who include worldly matters under the definition of Bid`ah are plain ignorant. We do not say this. Consider this statement of the author of *Anwaar-e-Saati`a*:

"From amongst the ignoramuses are those who include everything which was not prevalent during the era of the Sahaabah as being an accursed Bid`ah, even though there is no proof for its being a detestable act. They (the ignoramuses) back their claim with the words of Nabi ρ: 'Save yourselves from new innovations'. These ignorant ones do not understand that this Hadith refers to the inclusion of innovations in the Deen of those things which are not a part of it." [Page 34]

Refer to all the above citations, and then reflect at the intellectual research of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan. He states:

"Nowadays, many a things that are in existence and have been invented were unheard of during the best of eras, and without which life would be difficult. Every person is constrained to use them. Trains, motorcars, aeroplanes, ships, horse and trailer, etc., etc. And then we have letters, envelopes, telephones, radio, loudspeakers, etc. All these things and their usage are Bid`ah. Yet, persons from every sector of the community make use of them. Tell us, will the Deobandis and Wahhabis manage to pass through life without these Bid`ah-e-Hasanas? Definitely not!" [Jaa`al Haqq, page 211]

The definitions of Bid`ah-e-Hasana and Bid`ah-e-Sayyia will follow later on. But, after reflection of the above quotation, Mufti Saheb must hide his face in his collar and take proper stock of himself and confess as to whose claim it is that every new invention is a Bid`ah. Is it his claim or that of the Deobandis and Wahhabis?

Beloved readers! Consider well what meaning Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan extracts from the Hadith ***"Whoever***

innovates into this matter (Deen) of ours which is not of it, is rejected.” He states:

> *“That person who innovates into this Deen of ours any belief which is contrary to the Deen is rejected. We have taken the meaning of (the Arabic word)* ***“Ma”*** *to be Aqaa`id (beliefs) because Deen is another word for Aqaa`id. Actions are corollaries.”* [Jaa`al Haqq, page 204/5]

Mufti Saheb must be asked as to why he had on his own side and contrary to the authentic Ahaadith and the statements of the Ulama, Fuqahaa and Muhadditheen included the condition of Deen? Since, according to his own words, this condition of Deen was not made in *Ash`atul Lam`aat and Mirqaat*. Explain to us this also your statement that "*Deen is another word for Aqaa`id. Actions are corollaries*". Without doubt, Salaat, fasting, Hajj, Zakaat, Jihaad, etc. are corollaries as far as Aqaa`id is concerned. But each one on their place also forms an integral part of Islaam and are amongst the principles of the Deen. In the Qur`aan Majeed and the Ahaadith, the word Deen is clearly applied to matters such as Salaat, Jihaad, etc. Many other examples can also be cited in substantiation of our point, but we will suffice on this. The crux of the matter is that whether it be regarding Aqaa`id or actions, Bid`ah can be found in all of them.

The fabrication of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan

Mufti Saheb has restricted the word ***“Ma”*** to Aqaa`id only. He says in this regard: *“It has been established that Bid`ah refers to Aqeedah”* [Jaa`al Haqq, page 205]. He states further on: *“The severe warnings that appears in the Ahaadith for Bid`ah and the Bid`atees refers only to Bid`ah-e-Aqeedah. It appears in a Hadith that the person*

who honours the Bid`ati has assisted in the destruction of Deen. It appears in the Fatwa regarding the perpetrator of a Bid`ah-e-I`tiqaadia in Fataawa Rasheedia, vol. 1, Kitaabul Bid`aat, page 90, that the Bid`ah wherein severe warning has been given against is with regard to those Bid`ahs in Aqaa`id. Like that of the Bid`ah of the Rawaafidh and Khawaarij." [Jaa`al Haqq, page 205]

Without doubt, the severe warning has been given for Bid`ahs regarding Aqaa`id, but Mufti Saheb must show us whether the issue concerning *Ilm-e-Ghaib, Haazir-o-Naazir and Mukhtaar-e-Kul* are all Masaa`il of Aqaa`id or not? Has severe warnings been given for such matters or not? Such beliefs were never present during the best of eras. How can it be that severe warning has been given for Bid`ah relating to Aqaa`id but with regard to corollary and other Masaa`il, the term Bid`ah does not even apply and no warning has been given fro them? **References have been sufficiently cited which show that Bid`ah applies to beliefs and actions.** The citations of Hafiz Ibn Katheer, Allaamah Shammi and other Muhaqqiqeen etc. have the conditions of beliefs, actions and conditions.

Hafiz Ibn Rajab states:

"Whoever innovates a thing and relates it to the Deen, whilst it is not a part of the Deen, then this is clear deviation. The Deen is free from such innovations. It is irrelevant whether this innovation relates to beliefs, actions or statements. As for the statements of some of the Salf which are amongst the good innovations. Such (statements) fall under the category of Bid`ah literally and not in terms of the Shariah." [Jaamiul Uloom Wal Hikam, page 193]

Sheikh Abdul Haqq Muhaddith Dehlwi (rahmatullahi alaihi) states on page 94 of *Maktoobaat* that whatever changes that are contrary to the Sunnat of Nabi ρ are a deviated Bid`ah and rejected. From this we ascertain that every new thing, be it Deeni or Dunyawi, is not necessarily rejected. The second thing that can be gleaned from his text is that it is necessary to follow the Sunnat in so far as Ibaadaat, Aadaat and beliefs. To oppose this is a Bid`ah and rejected. The third thing from this text is that the words "***Every innovation is deviation***" does not included every new thing, as Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan has indicated. In fact, according to the words of Hadhrat Sheikh Saheb (rahmatullahi alaihi) the import of the Hadith is Bid`ah-e-Shar`i. The fourth thing is that a Bid`ati is deprived of the Noor of Wilaayat. **The Noor of Wilaayat is only attained by following the Sunnat of Nabi ρ and a Bid`ati is completely deprived thereof.**

A doubt and its clarification

It is possible that Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb may aver: *"I did not mean that the condition of Deen does not appear in this Hadith, I meant that the issue of a Deeni thing has been placed by them."*

An answer to this is that both these conditions are present in the above-mentioned citations. The condition of Deen and that of action. This has come to light (from the above discussions) that any new innovation in the Deen, whether it be in relation to beliefs or actions, is rejected and baatil. **The Hadith *"Whoever innovates into this matter (Deen) of ours which is not of it, is rejected"* is general.**

The word ***"Ma"*** includes beliefs, actions, statements and desires, as has been borne out by the discussion. Therefore to limit it only to Aqaa`id (beliefs) as has Mufti Ahmad

Yaar Khaan, is baatil. In fact, in another context, this Hadith clearly includes the word ***"Amal"*** (action). Hadhrat Aisha τ reports that Nabi ρ said:

"Whoever carries out an action which is not from our matter (Deen), it is rejected." [Bukhari, page 1092, vol. 2 / Muslim, page 77, vol. 1 / Masnad Ahmad, page 140, vol.6]

From this authentic narration we can clearly see that Bid`ah is not only relating to beliefs, in fact, it relates also to actions. It is apparent from the words of Nabi ρ that for whatever work there is no authentication and there is no seal on it, then that action is rejected and baatil.

Note what emanates from the words of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan. He states:

*"The Shar`i meaning of Bid`ah is those beliefs and actions which were not present in the external form during the era of Nabi ρ. They were innovated later on. The result is this that Bid`ah-e-Shar`i is of two types: Bid`ah-e-I`tiqaadi and Bid`ah-e-Amali."* [Jaa`al Haqq, page 204]

This then is exactly what we have been saying all along, **that there are two types of Bid`ah, Bid`ah-e-I`tiqaadi and Bid`ah-e-Amali.** Warnings have been sounded against both of them (in the Ahaadith). There is a difference however that the warnings against Bid`ah-e-I`tiqaadi are more severe. But the fact still remains that warnings do exist for both of them.

Another glaring error of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb

He states:

"If we assume that the condition for a Deeni work exists for Bid`ah, then a Deeni work will be defined as that action wherein one anticipates reward.....Also whatever worldly action a person does with good intentions, he also received reward for it.....Therefore every worldly act of a Muslim is a Deeni one also. Now tell us, is it a Bid`ah to feed Pilou (rice dish) to someone with a good intention or not?" [Jaa`al Haqq, page 212]

The wisdom behind specifying *Pilou* is better known to Mufti Saheb himself. The secret as to why he is advocating and encouraging the feeding of *Pilou* is known to him. Why did he not specify general eating? Mufti Saheb must tell us if he ever came across the word *"Mubaah" (permissible)* in any Fiqh Kitaab? If he does not have any other Kitaab at his disposal then he should refer at least to *Khulaasaa-e-Keidaani*. If he does not have access to this, then at least he should refer to *Anwaa-e-Saatia*, wherefrom he took random excerpts and compiled his *Jaa`al Haqq*. Therein it is stated:

***"And some Mubaah (permissibilities), that is, there doing warrants neither reward nor punishment."* [Anwaar-e-Saatia, page 47]**

There are some actions of the Muslim which warrants no reward or punishment. In fact, Mufti Saheb has himself in substantiation of a certain matter clearly stated that in *Mubaah* there is no relation with reward [see Jaa`al Haqq, page 305]. What more proof does Mufti Saheb need over this?

A basic error of the Ahle Bid`ah

Other Ahle Bid`ah, especially Molvi Abdus Samee` and Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan, are guilty of the error of claiming that the import of the words ***"Laisa Minhu"*** *(is*

not from it) are those beliefs and actions which are contrary to the Sunnat and the Deen. They take the meaning of 'being contrary' to be whatever Nabi ρ has not issued an explicit prohibition against. They aver that all those matters whereupon Nabi ρ remained silent are not regarded as an innovation or Bid`ah. And even if it can be categorized as a Bid`ah then it would be a Bid`ah-e-Hasana. In this regard, Molvi Abdus Samee` Saheb states:

*"Thus all the Ahle Islaam must know that whatever the commentators have written under the Hadith **'Whoever carries out an action which is not from our matter (Deen)'**, does not mean to exclude everything that is contrary to the Kitaab and Sunnat. Everything is not bad. The clear meaning of this is that whatever the Qur`aan and Hadith have explicitly prohibited is evil. Those things regarding which an explicit prohibition exists, their innovation is rejected."* [Anwaarus Saatia, page 37]

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan states:

*"If actions are included then the import of **'which is not from our matter (Deen)'** are those actions which are contrary to the Qur`aan and Sunnat."* [Jaa`al Haqq, page 213]

ANSWER:

This is the clear exposition and import of this ignorant and inane error: **Firstly,** the words of the Hadith had just passed now, where Nabi ρ states, "***Whoever carries out an action which is not from our matter (Deen)"***, that is, those things which have not been established from Nabi ρ are rejected. Nabi ρ did not say that those things are rejected which have been prohibited by him. There is a massive difference between the two.

Secondly, those things which have the explicit prohibition of Nabi ρ are forbidden. So how can these things even be considered as innovations and inventions? Why would it then be necessary to differentiate between Bid`ah and innovations, whereas Bid`ah and innovations are separate entities from prohibitions, as has been established from the authentic narrations and the consensus of the Ummat.

Thirdly, if Bid`ah and innovations are those things which have been explicitly prohibited in the Ahaadith, then how come there are two types of Bid`ahs – Hasanah and Sayyia? Can it ever be possible that after Nabi ρ had issued an explicit prohibition on a certain thing, there still remains the possibility of it being *Hasan* (good)? After an explicit prohibition, could not the Ulama of the Ummat understand that the lowest degree of a prohibition of Nabi ρ is *Karaahat* (detestment). How then could they formulate rulings of Waajib, permissible, Haraam, Makrooh and Mubaah for Bid`ah? [See Sharah of Muslim by Nawawi, page 285, vol.1]

Fourthly, to aver that the exclusion of those things which have not been prohibited in the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnat and that these things are not bad is also an ignorant and baseless claim. It is also in clear contradiction of the Muhadditheen-e-E`zaam and Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam (rahmatullahi alaihim). The Ulama have written that just as one gains proximity and the Pleasure of Allaah Ta`ala by practicing on the necessary Commands, so too does he attain this by obeying Allaah Ta`ala regarding on those things where there is lenience on the Shariah. **And also, just as Nabi ρ doing a certain act is Sunnat, his abstaining from an act is also a Sunnat.** Hence, to leave out an act which Nabi ρ left out is a Sunnat and to oppose that act would be a Bid`ah.

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari and Sheikh Abdul Haqq Dehlwi (rahmatullahi alaihima) present a Hadith thus:

"Just as Allaah Ta`ala loves that his Commands be obeyed, He also loves that His leniencies be adhered to."
[Mirqaat, page 15, vol.2 / Ash`atul Lam`aat, page 128, vol.1]

Also, Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullahi alaihi) states in commentary of the first Hadith in Mishkaat:

"Just as one follows in a certain action, so too does one follow in the non-execution of an act. So if one is punctual on an act which Nabi ρ did not do, he is a Bid`ati."
[Mirqaat, page 41, vol.1]

At this juncture Sheikh Muhaddith Abdul Haqq Dehlwi (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

*"Just as how to follow an act is Waajib, similarly, to leave out an act (which Nabi ρ left out) is also included as subservience. So whoever is punctual on an act which Nabi ρ did not do is a Bid`ati. This is what the Muhadditheen have mentioned."* [Ash`atul Lam`aat, page 20, vol.1]

The very same explanation is also mentioned in *Mazaahir-e-Haqq* on page 19, vol.1.

It is stated in the Sharah of Masnad Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullahi alaihi):

"Ittibaa` (following) – just as it exists in an action it also exists in not carrying out an action. Hence, if a person practices with regularity on an action which Nabi ρ did not do, he would be regarded as a Bid`ati. The reason

being that Nabi ρ said: 'The person who carries out an action which is not amongst our matters, is rejected'."

Imaam Allamah Sayyid Jamaaluddin Muhaddith (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

***"To leave out those things which Nabi ρ left out is a Sunnat just as to do an action which Nabi ρ did is a Sunnat."* [Al-Junnah, page 143]**

From the above it is established that it is a Sunnat to leave out those acts which Nabi ρ left out, notwithstanding the ability and reasons for its execution being present during that era, just as it is a Sunnat to carry out that act which Nabi ρ carried out. The person who does not practice on this Sunnat of Nabi ρ is, according to the Muhadditheen, a Bid`ati. This is exactly what we are saying – that all the acts which are perpetrated by the Ahle Bid`ah were possible to have been carried out during the time of Nabi ρ, i.e. if Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ wished to do these acts they could have done so, but Nabi ρ did not carry them out. For us to leave out these acts is also an act of Sunnat and to oppose this (i.e. to carry them out) is a Bid`ah.

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ cautioned against making *Saja`* (speak in rhyming tones) during dua, because Nabi ρ did not make S*aja`*. [Bukhari, page 938, vol.2]

Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ mentions:

"Your raising the hands more than what Nabi ρ raised his is a Bid`ah, that is above the chest." [Masnad Ahmad, page 6, vol.2]

Hadhrat Ammarah τ severely reprimanded Bishr Bin Marwaan when he saw the latter lifting his hands whilst on the Mimbar. He said:

"May Allaah Ta`ala destroy these two hands. I never saw Nabi ρ lifting his hands except to lift his forefinger." [Muslim, page 287, vol.1]

You will note that three very high-ranking Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ **displayed such resentment at acts which were not carried out by Nabi ρ.** Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ **prohibited the making of *Saja`*** during dua based solely on the fact that it was **never done by Nabi ρ or his Companions.** Although dua is such an effective and important act of Ibaadat, but the making of *Saja`* in dua was discouraged merely because neither Nabi ρ nor his Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ did it. Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ stated the act of lifting the hands higher than the chest when making dua as being a Bid`ah **simply because when Nabi ρ made dua he did not lift his hands higher than his Mubarak chest.** Hadhrat Ammarah τ cursed Bishr Bin Marwaan because he exceeded in the lifting of his hands whilst on the Mimbar **more than what Nabi ρ would.**

Consider well how these pious personalities regarded even the slightest change in the Sunnah practice as being Bid`ah, and they prohibited from it. Allaamah Sayyidud Deen Kaashghazi Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

"To perform more than 8 Rakaats (Nafl Salaat) at night and more than 4 Rakaats during the day is Makrooh by consensus." **[Muniyatul Musallah, page 102]**

It is mentioned in *Nahrul Faa`iq* that it is Makrooh-e-Tahrimi. The Ulama of the Ahnaaf have stated the reason

for this to be the non-existence of any narration to corroborate it. Allaamah Alaa`ud Deen Abu Bakr Bin Mas`ood Al-Kaasaani Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaihi) states, whilst substantiating from other Fuqahaa:

"It is Makrooh because to exceed upon this has not been seen from Nabi ρ." [Badaa`i Wa Sanaa`i, page 295, vol.1]

The author of *Hidaaya* writes:

"The proof for its prohibition is that Nabi ρ did not exceed this (amount of Rakaats). If it was not Makrooh then Nabi ρ would have increased on this to demonstrate the permissibility." [Page 127, vol.1]

It is stated in *Fataawa Kabeeri, Durrul Mukhtaar, Fataawa Ajeeb, Fataawa Ebrahim Shaahi and Kanzul Ubbaad:*

"It is Makrooh to make dua in Ramadhaan at the time of making Khatam of Qur`aan, in such a way that dua is made in a gathering and collectively. This is so because it has never been reported such from Nabi ρ or his Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ" **[From *Junna*, page 142]**

You may have noticed that the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam (rahmatullahi alaihim) have made the non-action of Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ as a proof (for omitting of an act). Hereunder are a few more examples:

Imaamul Muhaqqiq Al Mudaqqiq Ali Bin Abi Bakr Hanafi, the author of Hidaaya states:

"It is Makrooh to increase more than two Rakaats of Nafl (Sunnat) Salaat of Fajr after dawn sets in, because Nabi ρ

did not increase on this, notwithstanding his love for Salaat." [Hidaaya, page 70, vol.1]

As you may see that the Ulama have extracted the ruling of Karaahat (detestment) for an act which was not carried out by Nabi ρ. Besides this view of the author of Hidayah, there is no other proof for the omission of Nafl Salaat other than the two Rakaats Sunnat at the time of Fajr. If the Hadith ***"There is no Salaat after the rising of Dawn except two Rakaats"*** which appears in *Nisbur Ra*`ya on page 255, vol.1, is proven to be authentic, then it will be a case of *Noorun Ala Noor* (light on light), where the statement and action of Nabi ρ both substantiate one another.

At another juncture the Author of Hidaaya states:

"There is no Khubah on the occasion of Kusoof (solar eclipse), because it has not been reported such from Nabi ρ." **[Hidaayah, page 156, vol.1]**

Notice that the author of Hidaaya reports a non-action by Nabi ρ as a proof in the Shariah. He does not mention that Nabi ρ prohibited it, hence it is a forbidden act.

He states in another place:

"There is no Nafl Salaat prior to the Eid Salaat, because Nabi ρ did not do so, notwithstanding his love for Salaat. Then it is said (by some) that this prohibition only applies to the Eid-Gah. It is also said that this (prohibition) applies to both the Eid-Gah and out of the Eid-Gah, because Nabi ρ neither performed (Nafl) Salaat at the Eid-Gah or out of the Eid-Gah." [Page 153, vol.1]

You have noticed (again) that the author of Hidaaya has proven the impermissibility of an action due to Nabi ρ not executing the act. To present a Hadith that clearly prohibits the performance of Nafl Salaat prior to Eid Salaat at the Eid-Gah or out, will be a difficult task. According to the author of *Anwaarus Saati`a* and Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan, such an act should not be Makrooh or incorrect, because there is no explicit prohibition reported from Nabi ρ.

Allamah Ebrahim Halbi Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaihi) has stated that Salaat-e-Raghaaib (special Salaat performed during the month of Rajab) is Makrooh and a Bid`ah based on the following:

"Because indeed it has not been reported such (that they performed such a Salaat) from the Sahaabah, Taabieen or those following them." Kabeeri, page 433]

The famous Hanafi Imaam Ahmad Bin Muhammad, who is one of the most senior of the Fuqahaa, states regarding his research of a particular Mas`alah:

***"It is a Bid`ah because it has not been reported such from the Sahaabah or the Taabieen."* [Al-Waaqi`aat]**

Which Muslim is unaware of one of the most authentic Hanafi Fiqh Kitaabs, *Fatawaa Aalimgiri* and *Muheet*? Therein it is clearly written:

***"The recitation of Surah Kaafiroon until the end continuously is Makrooh, because it is a Bid`ah and it has not been reported from the Sahaabah or the Taabieen."* [Aalimgiri, page 264, vol.4]**

There is no authentic narration which has been reported wherein Nabi ρ has prohibited the performance of Salaat-e-

Raghaaib or the prohibition of the recitation of Surah Kaafiroon until the end continuously. However the Ulama of the Ahnaaf have stated it as being Makrooh and a Bid`ah. **As a proof they have only cited this much that such acts are not reported from Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ or the Taabieen (rahmatullahi alaihim). Even though an explicit prohibition does not exist for these acts.** According to the self-made and fabricated principle of Molvi Abdus Samee` and Co. such acts are not supposed to be Bid`ah or Makrooh, because there exists no explicit prohibition on them by Nabi ρ. Now people such a Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan profess to accept the Fuqahaa of the Ahnaaf and they are supposed to be Hanafis themselves, yet they practice differently.

From the above texts we note that the Fuqaha regard an act as being a Bid`ah merely on the basis that it was not practiced by the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ or the Tabieen (rahmatullahi alaihim). In *Bahaar-e-Shariat*, vol. 4, page 32, it is stated that the act of some people who perform Nafl Salaat in congregation on the night of Baraat is Makrooh and a Bid`ah. The Hadith which is presented by some in substantiation of this act is classified as *Maudooh* (fabricated) by the Muhadditheen.

The difference between Bid`ah-e-Hasan and Bid`ah-e-Sayyia

It is imperative that we differentiate and explain Bid`ah-e-Hasana and Bid`ah-e-Sayyia so as to clarify the issue with those who are unaware of the difference and so that they are not left in trepidation regarding the two.

There are two types of Bid`ah – lexicographic Bid`ah and Shar`i Bid`ah. Lexicographic Bid`ah is the term given to all things which are newly invented, which came into

being after the demise of Nabi ρ. This includes Ibaadat and Aadat (habitual things). These are divided into five categories: Waajib, Mandoob, Haraam, Makrooh and Mubaah.

Shar`i Bid`ah includes all those innovations which came into being after the three best eras and upon which there is no consent from Nabi ρ by way of word, action, clearly or by indication. This is that Bid`ah which is classified under Bid`ah-e-Dhalaalah, Bid`ah-e-Qabeehah and Bid`ah-e-Sayyia. The Ulama have dilated upon this.

"Bid`ah is of two types: one is a lexicographic Bid`ah and the other is a Shar`i Bid`ah. Lexicographically, Bid`ah is every new invention which includes Ibaadaat and Aadaat. This Bid`ah is further divided into five categories. The second type is that Bid`ah which increases (or decreases) in any revealed Deeni matter after the passing of the three best era. This increase is devoid of consent from Nabi ρ. There is no consent from Nabi ρ on these actions, neither by way of word, action, explicit or by indication. This is the meaning of Bid`ah-e-Dhalaalat" [Tarweejul Jinaan / Junna page 161]

For a more detailed explanation on Bid`ah-e-Hasana and Bid`ah-e-Sayyia refer to *Irshaadus Saari, vol.3, page 344, Umdatul Qaari, page 356, vol.5, Nawawi Sharah Muslim, page 285, vol.1* and *Mudkhal, page 257, vol.2*.

Haafidh Ibn Hajar (rahmatullahi alaihi) writes:

"The crux of the matter is this that if Bid`ah has an acceptable proof in the Shariah, then it would be classified as a Bid`ah-e-Hasana. If the Bid`ah has an unacceptable proof then it would be classified as Bid`ah-e-Qabeehah. Otherwise it would be Mubaah. Bid`ah is divided into five categories." [Fathul Baari, page 219, vol.4]

A similar explanation is given in Allamah Aini's *Umdatul Qaari*. Refer to page 356, vol.5.

Now this much remains to be explained, that what is acceptable in the Shariah and what is unacceptable in the Shariah. Hadhrat Imaam Shaafi (rahmatullahi alaihi) states:

*"Bid`ah is of two types. That Bid`ah which contradicts the Kitaab (Qur`aan Majeed), Sunnah, Ijma or Athar of a Sahaabi. This is Bid`ah-e-Dhalaalah. That Bid`ah which does not contradict anything of these, this is a Hasan Bid`ah, in accordance to the words of Hadhrat Umar τ: **'This is a good Bid`ah'**"* [Minhaajus Sunnah, page 128, vol.2]

The entire discussion on the above has already been placed before the readers, that just as there exists opposition to words, there exists opposition to action as well. That action which Nabi ρ left out notwithstanding the conditions and ability being in existence during his era and that the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ and Taabieen also left out is undoubtedly a Bid`ah and deviation. This is so because it is in contradiction to the Kitaab, Sunnat, Ijma of the best of eras and Qiyaas. If there exists a little proof for it, then sometimes it may be a good action, whereupon reward is due and sometimes it is merely a permissible action which warrants neither reward nor sin.

The summary of the discussion of Qiyaas in *Majaalis-e-Abrar* and the above-mentioned texts, results in the definition of Bid`ah-e-Hasan and Bid`ah-e-Sayyia is as follows:

Bid`ah-e-Hasan is that action whose prevention was removed after the demise of Nabi ρ. Or its conditions and

ability of execution came into existence after Nabi ρ. Some proof for its execution can be found in Kitaabullaah, Sunnat, Ijma or Qiyaas. **This is known as Bid`ah-e-Hasana or in other words it is also regarded as lexicographic Bid`ah, which is not rejected or accursed.** The texts of Allaamah Ibn Rajab etc. has already been quoted which adds more light on the subject.

As for that action, which could have been executed during the era of Nabi ρ but he did not carry it out and the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam τ, Taabieen and Tabe Taabieen, notwithstanding their extreme love and affection for Nabi ρ also did not carry out this action, then such actions are called Bid`ah-e-Qabeeha, Bid`ah-e-Sayyia and Bid`ah-e-Shar`iah. Besides this, the Ijtihaad of a non-Mujtahid, especially in our times, is definitely not classified as Bid`ah-e-Hasana. In this regard the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam (rahmatullahi alaihim) have stated:

"It is stated in Nisaabul Fiqh that Bid`ah-e-Hasana are those actions which the Aimmah-e-Mujtahiddeen have classified as Bid`ah-e-Hasana. If any person in our era classifies anything as Bid`ah-e-Hasana then this is contrary to the Haqq, because it is stated in Musaffa that all Bid`ah in our era are deviation." [Fatawaa Jaamiur Riwaayat and Junna, page 60]

From this text we clearly see that Bid`ah-e-Hasana is only that which the Aimmah-e-Mujtahiddeen have classified as such. Ijtihaad and Qiyaas are only permissible in those issues and Masaa`il regarding which no Qur`aanic or Ahaadith texts exist, and the conditions and possibility of their execution did not exist during the time of Nabi ρ and the best of eras, in fact, it (conditions and possibilities of execution) came into existence only after these eras. If any person in this present age classifies any new action as a

Bid`ah-e-Hasana, then his claim would be totally rejected and discounted.

This is that Bid`ah regarding which Mujaddid Alfe Thaani (rahmatullahi alaihi) stated:

“How can those things which are rejected ever be regarded as Hasan and good?” [Maktoobaat, part 3, page 72]

The claim of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan has classified all Bid`ah-e-Sayyia as Bid`ah-e-Hasana and has quoted as proof *Mirqaat* and *Ash`atul Lam`aat*. He proudly avers: *“No Deobandi, Ghair Muqallid or Shirk and Bid`ah perpetrator, in the entire world, can ever define these four things (Bid`ah, Shirk, Deen and Ibaadat) in such a way so as to save his creed. Today also, we make an open challenge to all Deobandis and Ghair Muqallids that they present such a clear and authentic definition which classifies Mehfil-e-Meelaad as Haraam.”* [Jaa`al Haqq, page 213]

It has already been explained that it is a Sunnat to do an act or leave out that act which was accordingly done in the best of eras, notwithstanding the conditions and possibility of their execution existing during that time. To oppose a Sunnat is a Bid`ah and deviation. **Mufti Saheb must tell us who during the best of eras celebrated Meelad?** The definition of Bid`ah has been given in detail in this treatise and the definitions of Shirk, Ibaadat and Deen have all been given in other Kitaabs.

CHAPTER THREE

A glance at the proofs which have been cited to substantiate and give permissibility to the various bid'ahs

Some persons of the Ahle Bid'ah, specifically Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan, write after quoting the Aayaat, ***"O You who believe! Ask not about things which …"*** and ***"Say (O Muhammad ρ, 'I find not in that which has been revealed to me anything forbidden…"***, *"Allaah Ta`ala also states, 'Say (O Muhammad ρ! 'Who has forbidden the adornment with clothes given by Allaah, which He has produced for His slaves, and Tayyibaat (Halaal) of food..'. From these Aayaat we ascertain that if there is no proof for a thing being Haraam, then it is Halaal and not Haraam. These people establish Haraam by it…"* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 219]

These Aayaat can certainly not be used to prove bid'ah as is being done (by the Ahle Bid'ah. It is clearly incorrect to extract permissibility for the evil acts from such Aayaat.

Is there initial permissibility in a thing?

Most of the perpetrators of bid'ah incorrectly clutch at these Aayaat as proof for their innovations and aver that since there is initial permissibility of all things, hence their actions are also permissible. Based on this erroneous assumption of theirs they base many/all of their bid'ahs. Molvi Abdus Samee Saheb, cites a few Ahaadith and writes that from these Ahaadith the Ulama have extracted a great principle, **that there is initial permissibility in all things.** [Anwaarus Saat`ia, page 36]

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb writes, *"What do those who label every bid'ah as Haraam have to say about the general rule which states, 'The original (ruling) of every thing, is permissibility.'"* He states further, citing from Shaami, *"The preferred view is that the original (ruling) is permissibility according to the majority amongst the Hanafis and Shaafis."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 318]

Reply

According to some Muhaqqiqeen there is no general ruling for this. It should also be taken into consideration that every bid'ah is not Haraam, some are Makrooh. We have to firstly see what the meaning of initial permissibility entails, and what light is shed thereupon by the Ahaadith. We should also see if this ruling is unanimous amongst the Fuqahaa or if any differences exist amongst them. Also, which group leans to the preferred view. Or whether this difference existed in former times or only in recent.

We will firstly list the narration of Hadhrat Abdullaah ibn Abbaas τ, *"Rasulullaah ρ said, 'Issues are divided into three parts; one is that which is clearly on the truth, you should follow it; second is that whose deviation is clear,*

save yourself from it; and lastly is that wherein there is doubt, that you should entrust to Allaah.” [Ahmad / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 31]

From the last portion of this Hadith we glean that if there is doubt or uncertainty in an unclear matter, then such issues should be entrusted unto Allaah Ta`ala and we should maintain silence on it. It should not be that we legitimise the issue. Allaamah Tayyibi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 743 A.H.] stated, *“As for that thing whose ruling is not known in the Shariah,* ***no comment should be made on it and it should be entrusted to Allaah.”***
Hadhrat Sheikh Abdul Haqq Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) states in commentary of *“And entrust it unto Allaah Ta`ala”*, *“Then you must pass the matter to Allaah Ta`ala, and not comment on it.”* [Ash-`atul Lam`aat, vol. 1, page 97]

From this Hadith and commentaries thereof, **we realise that no comment be made on such issues regarding which there is no Shar`i ruling.** Such matters must be entrusted unto Allaah Ta`ala and we should not understand it to be permissible and give a ruling as such.

The narration of Hadhrat Abu Tha`laba Al-Khushni (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 75 A.H.] also indicate **towards this maintaining of silence (reservation).** He states that Nabi ρ said, *“Allaah Ta`ala had specified certain Faraaidh, so do not destroy them. He has made certain things Haraam, so do not betray them. He has specified certain limits, so do not transgress them. Certain things, without having forgotten, Allaah Ta`ala has maintained silence regarding them, so do not discuss them.”* [Daar Qutni / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 32]

This narration also indicates towards maintaining of silence (*tawaqquf - reservation*), as is apparent. The famous, Imaam Allamah Alauddeen Muhammad bin Ali Al-Khaskafi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1088 A.H.] writes, *"The correct and triumphant view is that the original ruling in all things is tawaqquf."* [Durrul Mukhtaar, vol. 1, page 20]

In the commentary of *Durrul Mukhtaar, Tawaali`ul Anwaar*, it is stated at this juncture, *"In support of that view which has the strongest proofs,* ***it is that there is tawaqquf in the initial (ruling) of all things.*** *Therefore the permissibility of permissible things is not known, except through the statement or action of Nabi ρ."*

Also at this juncture, a similar comment is stated in *Tahtaawi*, in the footnote of *Durrul Mukhtaar*.

It is stated in *Ta`liqaat-e-Sharah Manaar*, *"Our companions have stated that the initial (ruling) in this matter is tawaqquf…This is the most correct view in my opinion in this chapter, because in those matters which the Shariah has maintained silence, the most cautious and safest avenue is to practice tawaqquf. This is also the math-hab (way) of Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthmaan and other senior Sahaabah (radhiallahu anhum ajmaeen). The correct view is that the initial ruling of Hurmat (impermissibility) is applicable to all actions. This is the view of Hadhrat Ali τ, the Ahle Bait and the Ahle Kufa. This is also the view of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh)."* [Extracted from Al-Junna, page 165]

Now consider this text. The view of many senior Sahaabah τ is that *tawaqquf* be exercised as an original ruling in matters wherein the Shariah has maintained silence and then according to other great Sahaabah τ, like Hadhrat Ali

τ and also Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), the initial ruling is to be regarded to be one of Hurmat.

Sheikh Ahmad Mullah Jeeyoon Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1130 A.H.] writes, *"The initial ruling in things is permissibility, as is the view of one group. However, the jamhoor (majority) are opposed to this view. They are of the opinion that the initial ruling in anything is Hurmat. Imaam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayh) states that there is nevertheless, Hurmat, initially in any thing."* [Tafseer Ahmadi, page 6]

The famous Muhaqqiq Aalim Muhibbullaah Bahaari Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1109 A.H.] writes, *"Ibaahat (permissibility) is a Shar`i ruling and it is a proclamation for the Shariah where the choice to do or not to do has been granted (by the Shariah)."* [Musallimuth Thuboot, page 45]

Allamah Ibn Rushd (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Mubaah is the choice to do or not to do."* [Hidaayatul Mujtahid, vol. 1, page 4]

Mullah Mubeen states in the commentary of *Musallim*, *"Mubaah is in reality the Shariah's way of granting the choice between executing and not executing an action."*

Imaam Muhammad bin Muhammad Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 505 A.H.] writes, *"The definition of Mubaah is that there is permission from Allaah Ta`ala to carry out an action or to abandon it. This excludes any censure or praise for the one who executes it and censure or praise for the one who does not execute it."* [Al-Mustasfa, vol. 1, page 66]

From all the above text we see that *Mubaah* is also a Shar`i *hukm* which gives one the choice to carry out or abandon an act. No act is granted the status of being *Mubaah* without the express statement or action of Nabi ρ. Although some have stated that the initial ruling in a thing is *Ibaahat*, the majority oppose this view. The express view of Hadhrat Ali τ, the Ahle Bait, the Fuqahaa and Muhadditheen of Kufa (rahmatullah alayhim), especially Imaams Abu Hanifah and Shaafi (rahmatullah alayhima) is that there is initially Hurmat in a thing. The rest of the majority opine that (at least) there is *Tawaqquf*. In fact, the author of *Durrul Mukhtaar* has explicitly stated, *"The most authentic view of the Ahle Sunnah is that there is tawaqquf (as the initial ruling) in all things, and the ruling of Ibaahat is the view of the Mu`tazilahs."* [Durrul Mukhtaar, vol. 1, page 345]

Mufti Saheb should have asked the meaning of this text from someone else, at least. He should contemplate over the fact that whose view is it that there is initially *Ibaahat* in things. **Since there is no consensus on the *asl*, how then will be permissible to open the doors of *Qiyaas* and base the perpetrations of bid'ah thereupon?** As for those Ulama who opine for *Ibaahat*, they also differentiate between factors of material and spiritual. Mullah Muhibbullah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) states in his great and in-depth work, *"However, as for the difference of opinion that exists amongst the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat that there is Ibaahat in the initial of everything and action, as is the view of the majority of Hanafis and Shaafi'is, or whether there is prohibition (in the initial of every action), as other Ulama opine, the conciliatory path between these views is* ***as Imaam Sadrul Islaam has stated that there is initial Ibaahat in material and monetary issues, but in spiritual matters, precaution and prohibition is the Initial (ruling)."*** **[Musallimuth Thuboot, page 22]**

From this text we realise that the difference of opinion between the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat is not restricted to only *Ibaahat* and *Tawaqquf*, it extends to the difference between *Ibaahat* and precaution/ prohibition. If the one group opine that the initial ruling in things is *Ibaahat*, then the other say there is prohibition. Imaam Sadrul Islaam, clears this mist for us and explains that the *Ibaahat* is in matters pertaining to wealth and material things, whereas the prohibition and precaution apply to matters pertaining to the spiritual self.

Secondly, as for those who opine that the *asl* in everything is *Ibaahat*, we gather that their import in this view is that this applies to matters of habit and external issues and not to matters of Ibaadat.

They accept this view insofar as social etiquette is concerned and not to Ibaadaat. If this was not the case, then every person could them initiate new acts of Ibaadat and rule that it would be permissible. For example, let us assume that some bid'ah-loving person decides to introduce a sixth Salaat for the day, and also that in every Rakaat of this Salaat he says there should be two rukus and four sajdahs each. So now, do we grant acceptability to this new idea based on the view that there is *Ibaahat* in every *asl*? In short, to extend and apply this rule of *Ibaahat* in *asl* to acts of Ibaadat is sheer ignorance.

Allamah Abu Is`haq Shaatbi Gharnaati (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 790 A.H.] writes, *"It is incorrect to aver that in acts of Ibaadat there is a difference of opinion. (It cannot be argued whether) There is in (an act of Ibaadat) asl Ibaahat or asl prohibition. The reason being that in acts of Ibaadat, The Shaari' had stipulated and decreed them. If we assume that a person introduces a sixth Salaat*

(for the day), then we cannot say that based on the asl of acts being permissible, this is also acceptable, and that a sane person has the right to introduce such (things in the Shariah). This will be absolutely baatil." [Al-I`tisaam, vol. 1, page 301]

Allamah Abdur Rahmaan bin Ahmad bin Rajab Al-Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 795 A.H.] writes, *"If any person adds to a Mashroo' (Shar`i prescribed) act that which is not Mashroo', will be rejected. There will be no reward for this addition and sometimes it so happens that because of this addition the actual act is nullified. For example, if a person adds a rakaat to a Salaat. Sometimes it so happens that the act in itself is not rendered baatil, like if a person makes wudhu four times (in succession), however, there will be no reward for this."* [Jaamiul Uloom wal Hikam, page 43]

From this we understand that if the commission or omission of any act is prescribed in the Shariah, then to add or subtract to it according to one's own whims and fancies is rejected. Sometimes, due to this addition the actual act is rendered completely null and void. Besides being rejected, there is no reward for such additions or subtractions. This is not regarded as a means of gaining proximity or as an ibaadat.

Thirdly, this difference between the Fuqahaa regarding *asl Ibaahat*, *tawaqquf* or prohibition in things refers to matters which existed before the advent and coming of the Shariah. That is, before Nabi ρ was sent with the Message.

One group opine *Ibaahat* in all things and the other precaution or *Tawaqquf* (excluding of course kufr, which has remained Haraam through all ages). In other words this difference of opinion is regarding matters which prevailed

prior to the advent of the Shariah and not after. After the Shariah had been established this question does not even arise as to whether there is *Ibaahat*, prohibition, precaution or *Tawaqquf*, because every act should remain and is within the confines of the Shariah. There is absolutely no scope to increase or decrease in any Shar`i ruling. Hence, the issue of *Ibaahat-e-asli* does not benefit the pernicious intentions of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb and others. Allamah Abdul Ali Bahrul Uloom Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1225 A.H.] writes, *"By studying the statements of the Ulama-e-Kiraam we realise that this difference pertains to the time prior to the advent of the Shariah."*

After discussing this mas`alah in detail, he states further, *"After researching this matter we realise that this difference pertains to the era of fitrah (initial stages), where due to the shortcomings of the former peoples the Shariah was declining. The result was that those people who came after the Shariah was totally destroyed, where they had no realisation of the laws and rules of the Shariah, this ignorance created a reason that every action was regarded as being (initially) permissible. That is, they would not be punished because of executing the act or for abandoning it, as is the ruling with all Mubaah acts. This is the maslak of the majority Hanafis and Shaafis…And this issue (i.e. the view of Ibaahat-e-asliya refers to the era prior to our Shariah, which was the era of fitrah. There was no real harm in this, and it excluded kufr, which remained Haraam in all eras and times."* [Fawaatihur Rahmoot, vol. 1, page 49, 50]

It is apparent from this text that the preferred view of the majority Hanafis and Shaafis **is that *Ibaahat-e-Asli* regards the era prior to the advent of the Shariah.** They most certainly do not opine this view to be applicable, after

the Shariah had been revealed. This is clear and apparent as is gleaned from many Kitaabs, like *Badaaius Sanaa'i*, that this difference existed regarding the era prior to the Shariah.

The specific words, *"prior to the Shariah"* and *"prior to Nabuwwat"* are to be taken into account.

Summary: *Ibaahat-e-Asli* being applicable to all things is not the unanimous view of the Fuqaha-e-kiraam, in fact according to the author of *Durrul Mukhtaar* this is the view of the *Mu'tazilahs,* and not the Ahle Sunnah. Many Ulama amongst the Ahle Sunnah have opted for *Tawaqquf* , precaution and Hurmat. And this also is not applicable to Ibaadaat, only to Ma'mulaat. Also the view of *Ibaahat-e-Asli* only refers to the era prior to the Shariah and not after. Therefore to use this as a proof to substantiate the vile perpetrations of bid'ah, as is being done by the likes of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb etc. is treason to the Deen of Islaam. May Allah Ta`ala save every Muslim from this.

Proving a bid'ah with the Hadith *"He who initiates a virtuous act…"*, and its reply

Many bid'ah lovers quote this Hadith in substantiation of their vile perpetrations, therefore it is appropriate that we proffer a suitable reply. The words of the Hadith are as follows: *"Whoever initiates in Islaam a virtuous act, and it is carried out after him (his demise), then it is recorded for him the reward of the executers, without their rewards being diminished in the least."* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 341]

Reply

It is absolutely baatil and spurious to use this Hadith to substantiate bid'ah. **Firstly,** it is apparent from the narrations of Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ –see Mishkaat vol. 1 page 30—Hadhrat Abdullaah ibn Abbaas τ –see Mishkaat vol.1 page 30—and Hadhrat Ghadeef bin Haarith Ath Thamaali τ —see Mishkaat vol.1 page 31—that Nabi ρ said *"He who holds on fast to my Sunnat…"* and he said *"he who holds on fast to a good act"*, these narrations indicate that it is the duty of the Ummat to tread the Sunnah and hold on fast to it.

Secondly, it is also narrated in the same narration, *"Whosoever makes a call to guidance",* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 2 page 341 / Ibn Majah page19 / Majmaus Zawaaid vol. 1 page 168]. Through another chain, this same narration goes as follows, *"Whoever livens a Sunnat from amongst my Sunnats, which has died after me…"* [Ibn Majah page 19 / Tirmidhi vol. 2 page 92 / Mishkaat vol. 1 page 30].

In another narration it is stated, *"Whosoever livens a Sunnat from amongst my Sunnats, and the people practice upon it…"* [Ibn Majah page 19]

In another narration, "*That person who treads a good path…"* [Ibn Majah page 19]

In another narration it is stated, *"Whoever teaches someone knowledge, then for him is the reward of the one who practices it, without any decrease in the reward of the executer."* [Ibn Majah, page 21]

All these narrations are explanations and clarifications of the one brief narration, **that the import is not to initiate an act, rather to call towards it, educate regarding it, enliven it, practice upon it and to call others towards**

practicing it. To take the meaning of this narration as initiating a Sunnat, is incorrect, and is in contrary to these narrations.

And thirdly, the import of this Hadith is that the thing which has proof in the Shariah, be it *dalaalatun (direct)* or *ishaaratan (indirect)*, then there would be reward in its implementation. And also, this should be such an act whose causative factor and proposer was not present during the *Khairul Quroon* and only came into existence thereafter.
It should also be such that it falls within the ambit of the four proofs of the Shariah (*Adillah-e-Arba`a*). The condition of the act being *hasana* (good) is also coupled with the narration **and according to the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat, no act can be classified as either good or bad, unless it is established so by the Shariah.** The Shariah has cut bid'ah in its roots, so wherefrom can its goodness and benefit be established? In essence to prove bid'ah with this narration is crass ignorance and an open rebellious act against the Shariah.

Another error of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb and his ilk

Most of the Ahle Bid'ah quote one Hadith in substantiation of their accretions, just as Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan had done. He writes, *"Nabi ρ said, 'Whatever the Muslims regard as good, Allah Ta`ala also regards as good.'"* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 301]

Keeping this narration in front of him, **he says with reference to all bid'ahs that since the general Muslim public regard them as good,** therefore Allaah Ta`ala also regards them likewise, therefore there will be no punishment or sin in executing them.

There are a number of necessary pointers to consider in the discussion of this Hadith. **The first point** is that although some Fuqahaa have classified this Hadith as *Marfoo'*, it is not so. In fact, it is *Mouqoof* on Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ. In this regard, Allamah Jamaaluddeen Az-Zaila'ee Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away761 A.H.] writes, *"I have not found it except to be Mouqoof on Ibn Mas`ood τ."* [Nasbur Ra`ya, vol. 4, page 133]

The famous Muhaddith Allamah Imaam Silaahuddeen Abu Saeed Alaa`i (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away741 A.H.] states, *"I have not found it (this Hadith) Marfoo' in any of the Hadith kitaabs nor with a weak sanad, even after a detailed and exhaustive search and questioning. However it is Mouqoof on the statement of Ibn Mas`ood τ."* [Fathul Mulhim, vol. 2, page 409]

There is no doubt that the statement of a Sahaabi, especially one of the calibre of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ, is very reliable and weighty. However, insofar as the categorisation of the Ahaadith is concerned and in Usool-e-Hadith, the difference between *marfoo'* and *Mouqoof*, is something which we cannot simply ignore. The status of a *marfoo'* Hadith from Nabi ρ is certainly not the statement of any Sahaabi, albeit (the latter) correct. Haafidh Ibn Katheer (rahmatullah alayh), mentions after citing this *Mouqoof* statement of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ, *"(Its) sanad is Saheeh."* [Badaya wan Nihaya, vol. 10, page 328]

The second point is what exactly is meant by 'Muslims'? If the *alif* and *laam* in the word 'Muslimoon' were for *jins* (to denote the entire Ummat), then every one of the 73 sects of this Ummat will be successful, because each one of them believes their actions and deeds to be good, and it

would also conflict with the Hadith of *"that upon which I and my Companions are."* If the *alif* and *laam* were to denote *istighraak*, that whatever the entire Ummat regard as good then Allaah Ta`ala also regards that as good, this would imply *Ijma* of the Ummat. What doubt is there in *Ijma* of the Ummat being good? This view would not suit the Ahle Bid'ah, because their bid'ahs were not present during the *Khairul Quroon*, hence there is no complete consensus of the Muslim Ummah. And if *alif* and *laam* were to denote one special group amongst the Ummat, who if they deem an act to be good then Allaah Ta`ala also regards it good, then this group has to be of a high calibre. In that case, according to the Hadith of *"that upon which I and my Companions are"*, this would refer to the Sahaabah τ. In this case, it would be correct, **because whatever the Sahaabah τ regarded as good, was indeed good.** If we view this narration of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ in conjunction with other narrations of his, we will note that by the use of the 'Muslimoon' he refers to the Sahaabah τ.

Imaam Abu Dawood Tayaalisi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 204 A.H.] has reported this narration in the following words,

"Indeed Allaah Ta`ala looked into the hearts of His servants and in accordance to His knowledge He chose Muhammad ρ and sent him with His Message, then He looked into the hearts the people after him and He chose for him his Companions, and made them helpers in His Deen and the ambassadors of His Nabi ρ. Whatever the Muslims deem good, it is good in the Sight of Allaah Ta`ala, and whatever they deem evil is likewise according to Allaah Ta`ala." [Tayaalisi, page 33]
(More or less the same words appear in Musnad Ahmad / Zaila'i, vol. 4, page 13 / Diraayat, page 306]

Imaam Abu Abdullaah Al-Haakim (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 405 A.H.], reports this narration with an authentic *sanad* (authenticated by both Imaam Haakim and Allamah Zahabi), in the following way, *"Whatever the Muslims see as good, it is in the Sight of Allaah good and whatever the Muslims see as evil, it is in the Sight of Allaah evil, and the entire group of Sahaabah τ appointed Abu Bakr τ as Khalifah (since they deemed it as good, hence Allaah Ta`ala regarded it likewise)."* [Al Mustadrak, vol. 3, page 78]

From these narrations we see that according to Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ **the word 'Muslimoon' refers to the Sahaabah τ.** In fact, it clearly specifies that it refers to the Sahaabah τ.

"It is reported that Ibn Mas`ood τ said, 'Whosoever wishes to follow the Sunnat, then he should follow in the footsteps of those who had passed away, because those who are still alive are not immune from fitnahs. They (those whom you should follow) are the Companions of Muhammad ρ, who were the most virtuous of this Ummat. Their hearts were the most pure, their knowledge most deep and they were most informal (free from excesses and pomp). Allaah Ta`ala had chosen them to be the companions of His Nabi ρ and to establish His Deen. Recognise their virtue, follow in their footsteps and hold on, to the best of your ability, to their character and way of life. They were Straight Guided Path." **[Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 32]**

This narration is explicit in the fact that Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ regards the word 'Muslimoon' to mean the Sahaabah τ. On the one hand, Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas`ood τ emphasised and encouraged following in the

footsteps of the Sahaabah τ and warned against innovating acts contrary to their way.

"Follow in our footsteps, and do not innovate because you have been sufficed (with the perfect Deen)." **[Al-I'tisaam, vol. 1, page 54]**

On the other hand, he ejected from the Masjid some persons who had innovated a loud Thikr program there (this narration will appear in detail, later on, Insha-Allah Ta'ala). On that occasion, he did not categorise the action of these people under the narration of *"that which the Muslims see as good..."*, because it conflicted with the way of the Sahaabah τ.

The third point is that since it has now been established that the word 'Muslimoon' in this narration refers to the Sahaabah τ, and that whatever they deem as good, Allaah Ta`ala also regards as good and whatever they deem evil, Allaah Ta`ala also regards likewise. There can be no difference from the Ahle Bid'ah that most if not all, the innovations which they so rigidly adhere to, are not established from the Sahaabah τ. If these actions were any good in their opinion, then they would most certainly not have passed them by, and if they were not evil in their opinion, then they would certainly not have omitted their execution. Their knowledge was also very deep and expansive, and they also had profound love for Nabi ρ.

They had great fear for Allaah Ta`ala and immense concern for the Aakhirah. Hence, if they deemed an act to be evil and they did not carry it out, then certainly that thing is evil and detested in the Sight of Allah Ta`ala. This narration is in fact a strong proof *against* the perpetration of bid'ah, and not one in their favour! This will be

discerned by those whom Allaah Ta`ala had bestowed the good fortune to understand and follow the Sunnah.

CHAPTER FOUR

It is a bid'ah for anyone to specify (their own) time and conditions in acts of Ibaadat

It is not necessary that a thing which is evil from its inception only be termed a bid'ah. In fact, to add conditions, to change the form or stipulate a specific time for any important act of obedience and Ibaadat which the Shariah has left general, is also regarded as a bid'ah in Shar`i terminology. This is detested in Islamic Shariah. Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ [passed away 58 A.H.] reports from Nabi ρ, *"Nabi ρ said, 'Do not specify the nights of Jumuah for Qiyaam (Nafl Salaats) over the other nights and do not specify the day of Jumuah for (optional) fasting over the other days, unless it falls in the normal fasting (pattern) of any of you.'"* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 1, page 361]

From this narration we realise that the day of Jumuah enjoys special virtue owing to the Salaat of Jumuah, so because of this virtue it is not permissible to specify the nights of Jumuah for extra Salaat or the day for fasting.

Allamah Abu Is`haq Shaatbi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, in refuting and contesting bid'ah, *"And it is the making incumbent of the specific manner and form of these bid'ahs, like the manner of having a congregational session where Thikr is made in unison…and amongst them (bid'ahs) is the stipulating of specific times for certain acts of Ibaadat, whose specification is not made by the Shariah."* [Al-I'tisaam, vol. 1, page 34]

At another juncture he states, *"If the Shariah has encouraged a certain act, like Thikrullaah, and then a certain segment of the Ummah decides to specify this Thikrullaah to be made in congregation and recited in unison, or they stipulate a special and specific time for its execution, then this encouragement of the Shariah in no way can be used to prove this stipulation and specification, in fact, this (stipulating of conditions) is contrary to the Shariah."* [Al-I'tisaam, vol. 1, page 335]

Haafidh Ibn Daqeequl Eid writes, *"These stipulations of time, condition, manner or method require a definite proof that will make it being Mustahab in that way. This is the correct path."*

Further he states, *"Because certainly to rule its being Mustahab in this particular fashion requires a specific proof from the Shariah, which is imperative."*

He states further in refutation of a Shiah celebration, *"That third Eid which the Rawaafidh have initiated which they call Eid-e-Ghadeer, the congregating for it, establishing it as a sign of the Deen and holding it on a specific time in a particular manner, are all not established in the Shariah. And closer to this, if there is any form of ibaadat which is established in the Shariah to be performed in a specific way, and if some people initiate some changes therein and*

include this as an integral part of it, then this will be grossly incorrect, because in acts of ibaadat, the prescribed manner should be in force, and without it (changes) being sourced from the foundation (i.e. from Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ), it will not be acceptable." [Ahkaamul Ahkaam, vol. 1, page 51]

Whilst explaining regarding people gathering in the Masjid and making Thikr in a specific manner and form, the author of *Majaalisul Abraar*, quoted a narration of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ (which will be cited later in its context, Insha-Allaah Ta`ala), he states, *"This is what every person should be called (i.e. a bid'ati) who introduces into physical acts of ibaadat such things which were not present during the time of the Sahaabah τ."* [Majaalisul Abraar, page 133]

The reason for this is that the Deen is altered with this change in (original) form, and this is what is known as *Tahreef-e-Deen*. Hadhrat Shah Waliullaah Saheb, in discussing *Tahreef-e-Deen* states, *"And amongst the reasons is that doggedness is maintained. The reality of it is that such difficult ibaadat are opted from which the Shariah has not given a ruling. For example, if a person keeps continuous fast, remains constantly in Qiyaam or abandons marriage. Or a person remains so firm and steadfast on Sunnat and Mustahab acts as is done to Waajib acts…when such a dogmatic and severe person becomes the teacher or leader of a group or nation, then the people (his students or followers) begin to think that his (dogged and severe) actions are part of and encouraged by the Shariah. This was the ailment suffered by the Jewish and Christian Sufis."* [Hujjatullaah, vol. 1, page 120]

This is the reason why the divine laws were not left to the discretion of man. He has been made subservient in matters of *ibaadaat* and *muamalaat*, and also in matters of leadership and government, so that his whims, desires and fancies have no play in the Deen of Allaah Ta`ala. Allamah Ibn Khuldoon (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The Shariah of Islaam has come for his purpose that all conditions of man, (be they) ibaadat or muamalaat, even governmental administration, which is a natural social issue, are all firmly in line with (and in accordance to) the Deen. Man has been encouraged to keep in line with the Deen so that all his matters be governed by the Deen."* [Muqaddamah, page 190]
The famous Faqeeh, Abu Hanifah II, Allamah Zainul Abideen ibn Nujaim Al-Misri Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 70 A.H.] writes, *"Because the Thikr of Allaah Ta'ala, when it is specified for a particular time and not in any other time, or a condition is specified for the Thikr (which is not stipulated in the Deen), then this is not part of the Shariah, because the Shariah has not made these stipulations and conditions, hence it is contrary to the Shariah."* [Bahrur Raa`iq, vol. 2, page 159]

Allamah is telling us that even a meritorious act like Thikrullaah, which is a great ibaadat, but if the Shariah has not limited it to a specific time or stipulated that it be recited loudly or softly, or individually or in unison, or in any specific and particular manner, then to specify these limitations and conditions is contrary to the Shariah. This is, in fact, changing the Shariah (*Tahreef-e-Deen*), because the Shariah has not stipulated it such.

Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It is the habit of this faqeer not to stipulate any particular day over others unless it is granted preference by Shaari',*

like Jumuah and Ramadhaan are given preference by Shaari'." [Maktoobaat, part 4, page 67]

From this discussion it is crystal clear that if the Shariah has not specified a certain night or day for an ibaadat, or it has not specified any Thikr to be performed in a particular manner or condition, then it will be an act of bid'ah to specify any of this which is not done by the Shariah.

The ruling regarding the specification of any particular condition or manner which was specified by the Sahaabah τ

People may present the most advanced philosophical views, great observations, flowery poetry, etc., etc. but the thing which not every person can present all the time, is perfect obedience and following of the Rasul ρ. In the heat of the moment, it will be simple for a person to offer his life, but it is virtually impossible for a person to follow the Sunnat of Rasulullaah ρ and tread the Straight Path his entire life, without flinching, in every condition and state. This is the most difficult test. The entire group of Sahaabah τ have alighted successfully from this daunting task of perfect obedience. The Sahaabah τ have demonstrated the perfect life of Nabi ρ to the entire Ummat, in excellent form. They have shown every aspect of his perfect lifestyle, for mankind to follow.

Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood τ: The crux of a narration of Hadhrat Abdullaah ibn Mas'ood τ is that once he passed a group of persons who were sitting in the

Masjid and engaged in congregational Thikr. One of them was saying, *"Recite Allaahu Akbar 100 times"*, the complying group all then engaged in reciting the Takbeer using some pebbles. Thereafter he would say, *"Recite Laa Ilaaha Illallaahu 100 times"*, and they would all recite 100 times *Tahleel*. Finally he would say, *"Recite Subhaanallaah 100 times"*, and they would all comply. Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ asked them, *"What are you reciting using these pebbles?"* To which they replied, *"We are reciting Takbeer, Tahleel and Tasbeeh."* He exclaimed, *"Count your sins on these pebbles! I take responsibility that none of your good deeds are destroyed. Woe unto you, O Ummat of Muhammad ρ. How swift are you paving your destruction. The Sahaabah τ are still many amongst you, and the blessed clothing of Nabi ρ has not yet even decayed or his utensils broken…and you people have opened the doors of destruction (and bid'ah)."* [Musnad Daarmi, page 38 – with an authentic *sanad*]

Allamah Qaadhi Ibrahim Saheb (rahmatullah alayh), reports Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood's τ narrations in the following words, *"I am Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood! I take an oath on that Being besides Whom there is no deity, you have indeed brought a dark bid'ah or are you more learned than the Companions of Muhammad ρ?"* [Majaalis Abraar, page 133]

Sheikhul Islaam, Ibn Daqeeq (rahmatullah alayh), reports his narrations as follows, *"He (Ibn Mas'ood τ) said, 'When you see them, then inform me.' He (reporter of the narration) said, 'I informed him.' Ibn Mas'ood τ came with a cloth covering his head. He said, 'Whosoever recognises me, knows me and for those who do not, I am Abdullaah ibn Mas'ood. Do you people think that you are more learned than Muhammad ρ and his Sahaabah τ… ?*

You have indeed come up with a great bid'ah or have you exceeded the Sahaabah τ of Muhammad ρ in virtue?' Ibn Mas'ood τ criticised this act in the strongest and severest terms, notwithstanding the great significance of Thikrullaah." [Ahkaamul Ahkaam, vol. 1, page 52]

The objective of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood τ was to demonstrate that, although these forms of Thikr were very virtuous and recommended in the Deen, this particular form and manner which these people were practicing was alien to the way of Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ. This form and manner of recitation was in fact innovated by these people, hence it was a deviated bid'ah. It was, according to him a 'dark bid'ah' and a 'great bid'ah'. According to Imaam Ibn Daqeequl Eid (rahmatullah alayh), this particular form was not amongst the accepted forms of Thikr known to Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ.

The opposite party (Ahle Bid'ah) also accept this narration (as being authentic). Molvi Abdus Samee' Saheb writes, *"Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood τ has censured a group of people making loud Thikr, and labelled their act a bid'ah. This narration is listed in the Books of Fiqh and Hadith."* [Anwaarus Saati'a, page 24]

He states elsewhere, *"The word* **قاص** *appears in the narration, which refers to a story-teller who used to narrate stories in the evenings. During his story-telling session he would tell the people to say such and such (incite them to chorus?). This incident reached the ears of Abdullaah ibn Mas'ood τ, who went there. He chastised this person and told him that he had initiated a bid'ah. It is clear that this chastisement was not due to the new manner initiated, but rather because of his telling stories in congregation although Thikrullaah would also occasionally take place there. The Sahaabah τ would eject*

such person from the Masjid, who would narrate baseless stories therein." Anwaarus Saati'a, page 38]

In principle, Molvi Samee' Saheb had accepted this narration as being authentic. However, his interpretation that Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ had ejected them from the Masjid because of their story-telling, and his proving this using the word قاص as a basis, is baatil and weak. Firstly, the narration which led him off the track is the following one, *"A story-teller, who used to sit at nights and tell the people, 'Say this and say that.'"* [Ahkaamul Ahkaam, vol. 1, page 52]

This narration and its wording make it crystal clear that this story-teller used to incite the people, and he would show them this manner of saying such and such. This narration in no way, not even by indication, suggests that futile and useless narrations were being spoken there, and that these people would engage in Thikrullaah in between the talks. However, this much is established from this narration that whatever this person would incite the others to say, they would comply.

Secondly, we have established from an authentic narration in Musnad Daarmi that he would instruct the congregation to recite 100 times each *Takbeer, Tahleel and Tasbeeh*, and that they would comply. It was this congregational form of Thikr which disturbed Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood τ, which he subsequently labelled a dark and deviated bid'ah. The statement of the author of *Anwaarus Saati'a*, *"It is clear that this chastisement was not due to the new manner initiated,"* is his own concocted understanding and not even worth any consideration. The following appears in Musnad Daarmi, *"He (Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood - τ came and stood by them, and asked, 'What is this I see you people doing?' They replied, 'O Abu Abdur Rahmaan (this was*

his title), we are counting on these pebbles (the recitation of) Takbeer, Tahleel and Tasbeeh.' To this he said, 'You are counting your sins!'" [Musnad Daarmi, page 8]

Consider the actual situation! Can the author of Anwaarus Saati'a, in an unbiased reply, say that Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiallahu anhu) labelled the story-telling a great bid'ah or the congregational recitation of *Takbeer, Tahleel* and *Tasbeeh*? Was he opposed to this new-fangled manner or to the listening of stories? Was not Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ referring to their congregational recitation of *Takbeer, Tahleel* and *Tasbeeh* when he told them that they should count their sins on those pebbles, and then he labelled their actions as a great bid'ah? Or was he referring to them counting their stories on the pebbles? In short, this interpretation of the author of *Anwaarus Saati'a* is plain drivel and rejected. The comments of Sheikhul Islaam Ibn Daqeequl Eid (rahmatullah alayh) and Qaadhi Ibrahim (rahmatullah alayh) indicate clearly that Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ objected to the congregational manner of this Thikr program and it was this which he labelled a great and dark bid'ah.

Thirdly, the word قاص in the Arabic dictionary refers to a person who delivers sermons. It is a general term referring to good or bad sermons. Yes, the generally-accepted meaning of this word is 'story-teller', be it good or bad stories. It is strange reasoning to specify the meaning of قاص as only story-teller and that too, one who narrates untrue stories. Had the author of *Anwaarus Saati'a* only considered the words from the Qur`aan Majeed,

قص عليه / فاقصص القصص / يقص الحق القصص

etc., then he would not have faulted so badly.

Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ and the audible (loud) recitation of Durood Shareef in the Masjid.

The recitation of Durood Shareef is a great and virtuous act of Ibaadat, but recited individually and softly. The famous Faqeeh, Allamah Muhammad bin Muhammad Al-Khawaarzami, famously known as Bazaazi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 827 A.H.], the author of *Bazaaziya*, discussing loud Thikr, states, *"From Fataawa Qaadhi (it is established that) it (loud Thikr) is Haraam, as authenticated by (the narration of) Ibn Mas'ood τ, when he ejected a group of people from the Masjid who were reciting Tahleel and Durood Shareef upon Nabi ρ, loudly. He said to them, 'I do not regard you except as Mubtadi'een (bid'atis).'"* [Shaami, vol. 2, page 350 / Fataawa Bazaaziya, vol. 3, page 375]

Just look at the change of scenario today -- The person who does not join in the loud recitation of Durood Shareef in the Masjid is ejected by the Ahle Bid'ah. On the contrary, Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ had ejected the group of loud Thikr-makers from the Masjid and told them that in his opinion they are bid'atis. The group of detractors should take heed and lesson from this authentic narration.

Our noble readers have just read and noted the valued opinion and verdict of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ. Now take a look-see at what Molvi Muhammad Umar Saheb Acharwee says, *"The Wahaabis and Deobandis claim that it is bid'ah to recite Durood Shareef loudly in congregation after Salaat and they decry the reciters thereof. The Durood Shareef is necessarily recited loudly after the Fardh Salaat in the Musaajid of the Ahnaaf. You should now take stock of your actions and classify yourself*

as a Wahaabi or a Hanafi." [Miqyaas Hanafiyat, page 219]

Molvi Muhammad Umar Saheb, keeping the fear of Allaah Ta`ala, the reality of the grave and Aakhirah in front of him, must consider the decision of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ and decide whether he is a Sunni or Bid'ati. Do only the Deobandis say that loud recitation of Durood Shareef in the Masjid is a bid'ah or does Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ also say the same? Let him come to his senses and reply fairly. Mere lip-service alone does not make one a Hanafi.

This narration is also authentic according to the opposition group. Molvi Abdus Samee' Saheb writes, *"It is stated in Hamawi from Fataawa Qaadhi, 'Loud thikr is Haraam. It has indeed been authenticated from Ibn Mas'ood τ that he heard about a group who were congregating in the Masjid to recite Tahleel and Durood upon Nabi ρ in a loud voice. He went to them and said, 'This was not done during the era of Nabi ρ. I do not see you except as Mubtadieen.' He continued chastising them until he ejected them from the Masjid. It is established from the narrations that Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood τ did not merely eject these people because of their innovation, but also due to the fact that they performed Thikr loudly, which was contrary to the manner shown by Rasulullaah ρ. And this is exactly what we are saying that the innovation which is contrary to a Shar`i prescribed way is prohibited."* Anwaarus Saati'a, page 38-39]

In short, Allamah Qaadhi, Imaam Bazaazi, Allamah Shaami and Allamah Hamawi (rahmatullah alayhim), each one of these great personalities have authenticated this narration of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ. Even the author of *Anwaarus Saati`a* has reported it so. If Imaam Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh) was unaware of the *sanad* of this

narration, as is reported in *Sabaahatul Fikr*, page 68, then this does not mean that this narration is not authentic. As for the view of the author of *Tafseer Roohul Bayaan* that this narration is a lie and concoction, his opinion is not even worth considering. He classifies weak and concocted narrations as authentic and authentic Ahaadith as weak. Besides that, the classification of Ahaadith is not his au fait. This is the speciality and job of the Muhadditheen and Fuqahaa. The author of *Roohul Bayaan* is a Mufassir with a *sufi* disposition. He has included everything, be it authenticated or not, in his work [See *Ikseer*, page 82]. And that which he has said that this (censure and prohibition) was not due to the innovated method, is incorrect, because the very words of Ibn Mas'ood τ negates this view, *"This was not done during the era of Nabi ρ."* This statement of his is clear *nass* proof that this innovated method of Thikr recitation was not prevalent during the era of Nabi ρ. He did not say that this specific method was prohibited. Leaving aside this established proof from Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood τ, the prohibition of loud Thikr which appears in the Qur`aan Majeed and Ahaadith, as quoted by the author of *Anwaarus Saati'a*, page 38, *"And call unto your Rabb with humility and softly"* (Aayat), and *"Have mercy on your souls, verily you are not calling one who is deaf or absent"* (Hadith), he states, *"Some Sahaabah τ understood from this that loud Thikr is prohibited. Based on this, Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood prevented people (from making loud Thikr)…"*

Whatever else his view may be, the author of *Anwaarus Saati'a* has conceded that Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood τ regarded the loud recitation of Thikr and Durood Shareef as being contrary to the way of Nabi ρ. If only the Ahle Bid'ah take some lesson from this. As for the statement of Hadhrat Abu Waail Taabi'ee (rahmatullah alayh), which is extracted from Imaam Ahmad's Kitaab, *Az-Zuhd*, wherein

he says, *“These people thought that Abdullaah Ibn Mas’ood τ prohibited from making Thikr. I would sometimes go and sit in the company of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas’ood τ, and used to find him engaged in Thikr.”* This is most certainly not a proof or reply to Hadhrat Ibn Mas’ood τ preventing from loud Thikr. **The bone of contention here is not whether Thikr** is permissible or not. The recitation of Thikrullaah is established from the Qur`aan Majeed, authentic Ahaadith and *Ijma* of the Ummah. It is a great act of ibaadat and obedience. **The question is whether this form of congregational Thikr,** and that too, made loudly in a Masjid, and to recite Durood Shareef in this particular fashion --- Is all this established from Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas’ood τ or has he forbidden this and labelled it a bid’ah? It is clearly discerned from these Ahaadith that such acts are bid’ah and the perpetrators thereof are bid’atees. This was so intolerable to the Sahaabi that he ejected these people from the Masjid. The opposition should state fairly if we are Wahaabis because of our revulsion to loud Thikr and Durood in the Masjid, or is Hadhrat Ibn Mas’ood τ also to share in this fatwa of theirs? They should consider well their stance.

The status of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas’ood τ in Nabi’s ρ opinion

It is a fact beyond question and reproach that, after Nabi ρ, the best of this Ummat are the Sahaabah τ. They are the guides of this Ummat. However, there are some amongst them who are more superior to the others, and Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas’ood τ is amongst the senior Sahaabah τ. Nabi ρ held him in such high esteem that he said, *“That which Ibn Mas’ood likes for you, I also like for you and am pleased with it.”* [Mustadrak, vol. 3, page 319]

He also said, *“That thing which Ibn Mas’ood does not like for you, I also dislike it for you.”* [Al-Isti`aab, vol. 1, page 359]

Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) stated that Hadhrat Ibn Mas’ood τ was even more learned and knowledgeable in the Qur`aan Majeed (Tafseer) than the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen. [Sharah Muslim, vol. 2, page 293]

You can now see for yourself who is the most senior mufassir amongst the Sahaabah τ, and also upon whom Nabi ρ had the greatest reliance. He is the same one who has called the perpetrators of loud Thikr and Durood in the Masjid bid’atees, and he disliked their action. Since he did not like this act of theirs, then according to the words of the Hadith, Nabi ρ also dislikes such deeds. Whosoever desires may now follow in his footsteps, or whoever else he wishes.

Making loud Thikr in total isolation or in order to teach others, is another matter altogether.

Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar τ

Hadhrat Mujaahid (rahmatullah alayh) states that he and Hadhrat Urwah bin Zubair τ entered the Masjid, when *“Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ was sitting by the room of Aishah τ and the people were performing Salaatud Duhaa in the Masjid. We asked him regarding their Salaat, to which he replied, ‘(It is a) Bid’ah’.”* [Bukhaari, vol. 1, page 238 / Muslim, vol. 1, page 409]

The (validity) of Salaatul Chaasht (Duhaa) has been reported from Nabi ρ via numerous Sahaabah τ, through

authentic *asaaneed*. However during the era of Nabi ρ this Salaat was not performed in congregational form or especially in the Masjid. It would be performed wherever one was. This is a Nafl Salaat, and it is more virtuous to perform Nafl Salaat in the home than Masjid. When Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ saw the people performing this **Salaat in the Masjid and also** in this particular fashion, **he called it a bid'ah.** In commenting on this narration, Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The meaning of this (Ibn Umar's statement) is because of their making it apparent in the Masjid and in congregation. This is a bid'ah, not that the Salaatud Duhaa itself is bid'ah."* [Sharah Muslim, vol. 1, page 409]

The virtue of Tahajjud Salaat has been greatly emphasised in the Ahaadith. It has also been reported in authentic Ahaadith that Nabi ρ performed Tahajjud Salaat in congregation. However, if even this act is exceeded beyond the necessary then it is Makrooh. In this regard, Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh), in refuting a certain group, states, *"They perform Tahajjud Salaat in congregation, where people from all sides gather to perform it with specific purpose and intent. This act is Makrooh, to the level of Tahreemi. One group of the Fuqahaa have* ***said that the condition of calling to and making special arrangements for congregation (for Nafl Salaat) is Makrooh. They have also stated that the congregational Nafl Salaat be performed in one corner of the Masjid.*** *They have also stipulated that the congregation of more than three persons (for such Salaats) is Makrooh."* [Maktoobaat, part 3, page 10]

Imaam Ibn Daqeequl Eid (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Can you not see that Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhu) mentioned regarding Salaatud Duhaa that it is bid'ah, because in his opinion* ***its proof was not established,*** *and he did not deem*

it as being classified as a regular Salaat, which is specific to a certain time. Similarly, he regarded the Qunoot which was being recited in his era by the people as a bid'ah, because he did not deem it as being classified as a dua. Similarly, it is reported by Tirmidhi from Abdullaah bin Maghfal τ who told his son to save himself from innovation regarding the loud recitation of Bismillah, as he did not deem it as being sufficiently proven." [Ahkamul Ahkaam, vol.1, page 53]

It is well known that Salaat itself, *Qunoot* and the recitation of *Bismillah* are most virtuous, but since it was not proven to be executed in a specific manner, time or form, personalities such as Hadhrat Ibn Umar and Ibn Maghfal τ labelled them as bid'ah and exhorted abstention from them (in these unproven forms).

Although it is Sunnat to make *Musaafaha* (shake hands) and *Muaanaqah* (embrace), but since its execution is not established after every Salaat and specifically after Jumuah Salaat, it will be bid'ah to do it on these occasions. This occasion for *Musaafaha* has been refuted in many kitaabs, like *Ar-Tarsheeh* of Allamah Teebi, *Multaqit, Idaahul Mutaalib, Khulaasatul Fiqh, Kaafi, Fataawa Ebrahim Shaami, Naasiri, Haashiyatul Masaabih, Majaalisul Abraar, Madkhal, Fataawa Ibn Hajar,* etc. [See Al-Junna, page 130 – 146]

Allamah Teebi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Musaafaha after Salaat is Makrooh, under all conditions, because it is amongst the sunnats of the Rawaafidh. This is also the ruling regarding Muaanaqah."* [Al-Junna, page 130]

As for Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) who stated in *Kitaabul Athkaar* that this *Musaafaha* is fine, has erred. Mullah Ali Qaari and Ibn Ameer Al-Haaj (rahmatullah

alayhima) have refuted this view of Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) and established that this practice is bid'ah. Allamah Shaatbi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"There is no proof in the Shariah which indicates towards these specific times (for Musaafaha). In fact, it is Makrooh."* [Al-I'tisaam, vol. 1, page 280]

From these texts we establish that a specific issue cannot be proven using a general ruling, until a specific exception can be found to establish it. No one has the right in the Shariah to make *khaas* an *aam* proof, in accordance to his own fancy. To make a *Mutlaq* into *Muqayyid* or *aam (general)* into *khaas (specific)* (without Shar`i evidence) are all what are regarded as alteration in the Deen. This is what Imaam Gharnaati (rahmatullah alayh) has to say, *"To make Mutlaq (general) into Muqayyid (specific), when this taqyeed (making Muqayyid) has not been established in the Shariah is to introduce one's own opinion in the Deen."* [Al-I'tisaam, vol. 1, page 284]

When there is ample proof from the Shariah which is present (to prove an issue), and then for one to make Qiyaas (on this same issue) is a great disservice to the Deen. This crime is aggravated especially when the person making this ijtihaad or Qiyaas is not even qualified to do so.
Allaah Ta`ala states *"And do not speak what your tongues blurt (that) this is Halaal and this is Haraam, that you fabricate lies against Allaah."* [Surah An-Nahl]

Haafidh Ibn Katheer (rahmatullah alayh) writes in commentary of this Aayat, *"And included in this (Aayat) is every person who innovates a bid'ah, without substantiating with Shar`i proof, or he makes Halaal something which Allaah Ta`ala had made Haraam or he*

makes Haraam a thing which Allaah Ta`ala had made Halaal, merely to suit his own whims and fancies.” [Tafseer Ibn Katheer, vol. 2, page 590]

Allamah Aaloosi (rahmatullah alayh) writes in the Tafseer of this Aayat that the view of Imaam Askari (rahmatullah alayh) is quire correct that you should not declare anything as Halaal or Haraam which is not established from Allaah Ta`ala or His Rasul ρ, otherwise you will become a fabricator against Allaah Ta`ala. *“Because the basis of Halaal and Haraam lies only with the Order of Allaah Ta`ala.”* [Roohul Ma’aani, vol. 14, page 248]

This then is the condition of our present-day bid’atis, in that they hasten to prove everything with their deficient intellect. They waylay and mislead themselves and their followers by making concocted interpretations of *nusoos-e-qat’I (clear categorical text)* and authentic Ahaadith. They aim to destroy the Sunnah with their bid’ah. Nabi ρ said, *“Soon your matters will be turned around by some men, after me, they will annihilate the Sunnat with bid’ah.”* [Ibn Majah, page 211]

This is the ailment of the Ahle-Bid’ah that they give vent to their desires and intellect in every issue. They ask, *“What is wrong with this?” “What sin or fault is there in this?” “What harm is there in this?” “This is also permissible!” “This is Mustahab!” “This is worthy of Thawaab”,* etc., etc. They have not understood the reality. A thing may be permissible, but it becomes impermissible by attaching conditions to it. Just see, to recite Qur`aan Majeed is rewarding, but we are prohibited from performing it in ruku and Sajdah [see Muslim Shareef, vol. 1, page 191]

It is permissible to make Nikah with a *Ghair-Mahram* woman, but on the condition that one is not already married to her sister, aunt or niece. It is permissible for a man to cohabitate with his wife, on condition that she is not menstruating. Wheat etc. is Halaal to consume, but becomes Haraam if it is stolen. How much more must we continue in explaining this rule? **In short, the Ahle Bid'ah make this principle and fatal error of establishing specific acts by using general rulings.**

An error of the author of Anwaarus Saati'a

Molvi Abdus Samee' Saheb cites from *Zurqaani, Ibn Abi Shaiba, Abdur Razzaaq, Fat-hul Baari*, etc., and states that it has been established from authentic sources that Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ has labelled *Chaasht* Salaat as a bid'ah-e-hasana, hence his refutation (of this Salaat) will not benefit those who prevent it. He states further, *"Hence those who claim bid'ah have been proven and those who prevent have been refuted."* [Page 40]

It appears however that the author of *Anwaarus Saati'a* has not reflected over the matter, because then he would not have blundered so. The narration of Hadhrat Mujaahid (rahmatullah alayh) which is reported in Bukhaari and Muslim Shareef, does not deal with question as to whether *Chaasht* Salaat is bid'ah or Sunnah, bid'ah-e-hasana or bid'ah-e-sayyi'a. This much is mentioned therein that the questioners enquired from Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ regarding the Salaat which the people were performing in congregation in the Masjid. They wanted to know about the status and ruling regarding the manner of performance. I reply to this question, Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ said that it is a bid'ah. He did *not* add the definition of *hasana* to his statement. **When one merely uses the term 'bid'ah', then bid'ah-e-sayyi'a is meant.** Yes, if he mentioned that

the actual *Chaasht* Salaat was a bid'ah-e-hasana, then this would have been a different matter altogether. In short, confirmation is one thing and refutation another. In the end, the author of *Anwaarus Saati'a* concedes, *"And some Ulama have opined that he did not object to the Salaat itself, because according to him it was a good bid'ah and virtuous. How could he object to it? In fact, if he did object, then it was because the people had gathered in the Masjid to perform this Salaat, with the same etiquette as they would for a Fardh Salaat, and this is contrary to the norm."* [Anwaarus Saati'a, page 40]

This much we can say is that if the Shariah has not stipulated any specific manner and form for an act of ibaadat, and the Shariah has left it general, then it is a bid'ah to grant undue consideration to it.

Hadhrat Naafi' (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 117 A.H.] narrates, *"A man sneezed nearby Ibn Umar τ and said, 'Alhamdulillahi wa Salaamu ala Rasulillaah.' Ibn Umar τ commented, 'I also accept 'Alhamdulillaah' (that all praise is due to Allaah Ta`ala) and 'Salaam ala Rasulillaah' (Peace upon Rasulullaah - ρ, but this is not the way Nabi ρ taught us. On this occasion (of sneezing) he taught us to say, 'Alhamdulillaahi ala kulli Haal.'"* [Tirmidhi, vol. 2, page 98 / Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 2, page 406]

It is established from authentic Ahaadith that the one who sneezes should say, *"Alhamdulillaah"*. The Ahaadith do not advocate that *salaam* also be conveyed to Rasulullaah ρ on this occasion. Ask Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ why he prevented the recitation of Durood and salaam and what difficulty did the words '*Salaam ala Rasulillaah*' cause to him? Is it a sin to send salaam to Rasulullaah ρ? Only the Wahaabis prevent from Durood and salaam on such

inappropriate occasions, have you now joined their ranks? He was a staunch follower of Rasulullaah ρ. He was well aware of the occasions when to recite Thikr, Durood and salaam. This is the reason why he prevented from it (since the occasion did not call for it).

Molvi Abdus Samee' Saheb interprets this narration of Ibn Umar τ thus, *"It is stated in Kitaabuz Zabaa'i in Durrul Mukhtaar, 'On two occasions it (Durood) is not uttered; at the time of sneezing and slaughtering.' Hence the salaam upon Nabi ρ was mentioned on an occasion of prohibition. Why then would he τ not prohibit on this appropriate occasion? Even we would prevent from a prohibited thing."* [Anwaarus Saati'a, page 152]

Reply

In passing, let us consider the status of this narration (quoted in the text above) – (Khaan Saheb Barelwi states that this Hadith unauthentic). We are saying that the prohibition of Ibn Umar τ was not because of this narration (that Durood is prohibited on two occasions), because he did not say that Nabi ρ prevented from the mentioning of his blessed name on the occasion of sneezing, therefore he is reproaching this person. In fact, he stated expressly that Nabi ρ taught them that on this occasion one should only say, *'Alhamdulillaah'*. He deemed it impermissible to add anything extra to what was taught by Nabi ρ. **This narration proves that it is impermissible to add anything extra to any issue which is established is the Shariah.** Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ did not object to this person's statement because of the Hadith, *"On two*

occasions it (Durood) is not uttered..” as is claimed by Molvi Abdus Samee’ Saheb.

A person once sneezed nearby Hadhrat Saalim bin Ubaid τ and said, *“Assalaamualaikum.”* Saalim said to him, *“On you and your mother.”* The man was affronted, and Hadhrat Saalim commented, *“Indeed I do not say except what Nabi ρ said (i.e. on the occasion of sneezing).”* [Tirmidhi Shareef, vol. 2, page 98 / Abu Dawood, vol. 2, page 320 / Mishkaat, vol. 2, page 406 / Muwaariduz Zamaan, page 479]

Molvi Abdus Samee` Saheb, made an appropriate comment after citing this narration by stating, *“The objection was made due to the fact that this person veered away from the specific Shar`i stipulated words of ‘Alhamdulillah’ and recited something else in its place. This was an innovation and changing the Deen.”* [Anwaarus Saatia, page 152]
This is precisely what we are saying that whatever the pristine Shariah has kept in place should remain so. Neither should Mutlaq be made Muqayyid nor vice versa. Aam should not be made Khaas nor Khaas Aam. That which has not been decreed as congregational should not be executed thus and that which the Shariah has not ordered to be made audibly should not be recited audibly. That which has not been specified to a special time should not be done so, because this will constitute a change and alteration in the Shariah. In other words this is a bid’ah, from which the Ahle Sunnah Wal Jama’ah is pure.

Hadhrat Mujaahid (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 102AH] said that once he entered a Masjid together with Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ in order to perform Salaat. The Athaan had already been given. A person began making *Tathweeb* (i.e. calling out ‘Salaat, Salaat’, thereby

calling the people to Salaat). Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ commented, *'Are you mad? Was the call to Salaat which was incorporated in the Athaan insufficient?'*. Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ said to Mujaahid (rahmatullah alayh), *'Take me away from here, surely this is a bid'ah.'* [Abu Dawood, vol.1, page 79]

Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ left that Masjid and did not perform Salaat there. It is reported in another narration that he said, *'Take me away from this innovation.'* He did not perform his Salaat there. [Tirmidhi Shareef, vol.1, page 28]

Towards the end of his life, Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar's τ sight was failing, hence he said to his guide to take him away from there. You have noticed how much of detestation Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ had for bid'ah that he did not even remain behind in the Masjid, where it was being perpetrated, to perform his Salaat. In today's time, we would offer many excuses and reasons for staying on, whereas these luminaries were the stars of this Ummat and the actual fountainheads of this Ummat. Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Sharah Muhazzab*, *"It has been reported that Hadhrat Ali τ once saw a Muat-thin making Tathweeb in Esha Salaat, and he exclaimed, 'Remove this bida'ti from the Masjid!' A similar incident is reported about Ibn Umar τ."* [Bahrur Raa`iq, page 261, vol. 1]

Allamah Gharnaati (rahmatullah alayh) writes that amongst the acts of innovations (bid'ahs) which the Salf-e-Saaliheen have rejected is *Tathweeb*. [Al-I'tisaam, page 114, vol. 2]

That *Tathweeb* which is mentioned in the Kitaabs of Fiqh refers to making those occupied in (intense Deeni) issues, like the Qaadhi, etc. aware of the impending Salaat. It does

not refer to recitation of any Durood Shareef or to the loud repetition of the words of the Muath-thin.

Hadhrat Ali τ

The following narration has been reported regarding Hadhrat Ali τ (passed away 40 A.H.), *"A man intended to perform some (nafl) Salaat on the day of Eid, prior to the Eid Salaat (at the Eid Gah). Hadhrat Ali τ prevented him. The man said, 'O Ameerul Mumineen, I am indeed aware that Allaah Ta`ala does not punish for (performing) Salaat! Hadhrat Ali τ retorted by saying, 'And indeed I am aware that Allaah Ta`ala does not reward for any action unless it was executed by Rasulullaah ρ or which He has ordained or encouraged. (Therefore) Your Salaat is futile and futility is Haraam. It is very possible that Allaah Ta`ala will punish you for it, because you have acted contrary to (the Sunnat of) Rasulullaah ρ.'"* [Sharah Majma' Bahrain, also in Junna, page 165 / Nazmul Bayaan, page 73]

Hadhrat Ali τ has demonstrated that since the performance of (Nafl) Salaat prior to the Eid Salaat was not reported from Nabi ρ, neither has he ρ encouraged this by word or action, hence its execution is an act of *'abath* (futility), which is Haraam. It is also very possible that Allaah Ta`ala punishes for the act of even Salaat, which is the most dear act of Ibaadat to Him, if it is done contrary to the way and action of Nabi ρ, and which he has also never advocated or encouraged. We shudder to imagine what sort of fatwas and epithets the muftis of today would hurl upon Hadhrat Ali τ for having prevented an act of Salaat! May Allaah Ta`ala save us all.

The author of Anwaarus Saati' accepts this narration in principle, but he fathoms an interpretation for it. In this regard he writes, *"It is apparent that this prevention was not solely based on the fact that such a Salaat at this time was not reported from Nabi ρ, and that if it is not reported then it is branded a bid'ah as the people of the opposite camp aver. In fact, the prevention of Hadhrat Ali τ was a strong proof, which the Ulama of Ahnaaf adhere to, that there is a clear prohibition in this regard by Nabi ρ . It is stated in Sharah Majma' that it has been reported that indeed Nabi ρ said, 'There is no Salaat on the days of Eid, before the Imaam.' This is precisely our claim, that innovation of such a thing is prohibited which is in clear conflict to an order or prohibition of the Shariah."* [Anwaarus Saati, page 39]

The author of Anwaarus Saati` has at least conceded to the fact that Hadhrat Ali τ had prevented a man from performing Nafl Salaat prior to the Eid Salaat. However, his proving that this prevention of Hadhrat Ali τ was due to the narration reported in Sharah Majma', where Nabi ρ forbade the performance, is incorrect. The question here is not what the proof of the Ahnaaf is for not performing Nafl Salaat prior to Eid Salaat or whether this prohibition is owing to Nabi's ρ explicit prohibition or his non-execution of it, or also whether this narration is authentic or not. The point here is that Hadhrat Ali τ, upon preventing the man from performing the Salaat, specifically mentioned his proof and reasoning. The author if Anwaarus Saati' has not pondered and reflected upon this issue properly. Hadhrat Ali τ only stated this, in negating the man's action, *"And indeed I am aware that Allaah Ta`ala does not reward for any action unless it was executed by Rasulullaah ρ or which He has ordained or encouraged."*

This statement of Hadhrat Ali τ is in absolutely no need of further dilation or analysis. This statement is a clear and unambiguous proof that Hadhrat Ali τ had prevented the man from performing Salaat, because in his opinion such an act (Nafl Salaat prior to Eid Salaat) was not reported from Nabi ρ, or that there was no clear encouragement for it by Nabi ρ. The 'logic' of the author of Anwaarus Saati'a is indeed astounding! He has not considered the matter properly and opted to use the proof of the 'neighbour instead of the one in the house'.

Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Abbaas τ

Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Abbaas τ once saw Hadhrat Ta`oos Taabi'e (rahmatullah alayh) performing Salaat after Asr Salaat and prevented him. (This narration clearly states that this was only a two rakaat Salaat). Hadhrat Ta'oos (rahmatullah alayh) presented some interpretation for the prohibition of Salaat after Asr. Hadhrat Abbaas τ retorted sternly, *"I do not know whether there is punishment or reward (for such a Salaat), because Allaah Ta`ala states,* ***'It is not appropriate for a believing man or woman, when Allaah and His Rasul have decreed a matter, that they have a choice in it.'*** *"* [Mustadrak, page 110, vol. 1]

In this narration, although Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ prevented and cautioned Hadhrat Taa'oos (rahmatullah alayh) based on the prohibition of Nabi ρ, nevertheless as mentioned previously, just as it is sinful to oppose the prohibition of Nabi ρ, so too is there no reward for acting contrary to the Sunnat of Nabi ρ. In fact, that too is a sin. You have noticed here that Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ had said that Hadhrat Taa'oos (rahmatullah alayh) is to be liable for punishment for acting contrary to the Sunnat.

Hadhrat Sa'eed bin Musayyib τ

In this regard there appears a narration of a man who normally performed two Rakaats after the Asr Salaat asking Hadhrat Sa'eed bin Musayyib τ, *"O Abu Muhammad! Will Allaah Ta`ala punish me for my (this) Salaat? He replied, 'No, but He will punish you for acting contrary to the Sunnat.'"* [Musnad Daarmi, page 62]

Here, Hadhrat Sa'eed bin Musayyib τ makes clear that whilst Allaah Ta`ala will not punish for the performance of any Salaat, owing to it being a great act of ibaadat, nevertheless, **He will most certainly punish for its execution which is contrary to the Sunnat of Nabi ρ.**

Hadhrat Uthmaan bin Abil 'Aas τ

Someone once invited Hadhrat Uthmaan bin Abil 'Aas τ [passed away 55 A.H.] to a **circumcision ceremony,** which he clearly turned down. When he was asked the reason for refusing this invitation, he replied in no uncertain terms, *"Indeed we never attended circumcisions (ceremonies) during the era of Rasulullaah ρ, neither were we invited to such."* [Musnad Ahmad, page 217, vol. 4]

Hadhrat Uthmaan Bin Abil 'Aas τ also employs the same ruling that since it was not the custom to celebrate and offer meals for circumcision; hence he did not participate in such activities. He did not say that his non-participation is due to the fact that Nabi ρ forbade such participation. You have seen that great Sahaabah τ like Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood, Hadhrat Ibn Umar, Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Uthmaan bin Abil 'Aas τ, etc. forbade participation and execution of great acts of Ibaadat like Salaat, Zikr, etc. to be performed in a specific manner and

form with regularity due to the fact that this was not the manner of Nabi ρ, neither were such acts encouraged by him, nor were they enacted during his noble era. Therefore such acts are branded as bid'ah. This is not just a common bid'ah, it is a great, dark and deviant bid'ah. May Allah Ta`ala save us.

According to Allaah Ta`ala and His Rasul ρ only those acts of Ibaadat are acceptable which are executed with sincerity and in accordance to the Sunnah, even though such acts may be small. However, those acts are regarded as futile even though they display a mountainous façade and are carried out without sincerity or in imitation of the Sunnah. Such acts are devoid of life and soul. Hadhrat Aishah τ once mentioned that Hadhrat Abdurrahman bin Abu Bakr τ did not have any children. Someone in the household commented that if a child is born to him then they will **slaughter a camel (for Aqeeqah).** Hadhrat Aishah τ said, *"No, the Sunnat practice is more virtuous, where two goats/sheep are slaughtered for a boy and one for a girl."* [Mustadrak, page 238, vol.4]
If one compares the value and meat derived from a camel to that of two goats/sheep, then the difference is apparent, notwithstanding this, **Hadhrat Aishah τ gave preference to that which is Sunnat.** In other words, the value of a Sunnat far outweighs any perceived worldly benefit. Nevertheless, the majority have also consented to the slaughtering of a cow or camel for Aqeeqah.

Some Aqli proofs in refutation of Bid`ah

Every government has formulated a set of rules to govern its subjects and all aspects of their lives. Obedience to these rules and laws are necessary upon all subjects and no government tolerates disobedience. If a citizen of Pakistan has to decide to introduce the use of British, Indian or any

other country's currency, then the government of Pakistan will haul him to court and file a case against him. If a Pakistani soldier has to report for duty in an American or any other country's uniform, then his fate is known to all. Leave alone this soldier donning the uniform of a foreign country, even if he wears the uniform of a train or bus conductor, we all know what his fate will be.

In essence whatever uniform is stipulated by the governing body of any sector, becomes necessary for all the employees in that department to dress accordingly. A person travelling on a train cannot use any other ticket besides the stipulated train ticket as his pass and he cannot gain entry if the price is 20 rupees with a 10 rupee ticket. If the relevant authorities will take objection to such impudence, what anger will there not be if the Path of Allaah Ta`ala and His Rasul ρ is substituted and altered? Allaah Ta`ala has set a certain standard for our deeds and measure for our actions. He has given us the model to follow in our lives, which is none other than the lifestyle of our beloved Nabi ρ. The Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) were paragons of this model. Every other way and means which conflicts with the 'uniform' and pattern shown to us by Nabi ρ, is rejected and an anti-thesis to our success and salvation.

In summary, no government has left its subjects to follow their desires and fancies in matters decreed by the state, just as we do not allow our workers and servants to act as they please, whilst in our employ, so too will any act which conflicts to the Deen and the Sunnat not be accepted from us.

This brief outline is sufficient for us to understand the correct position and difference between the Sunnat and bid`ah. Yes, as for those who will not accept, volumes

upon volumes will not be sufficient (to convince them). If the Sunnat (which includes the statements and actions of Nabi ρ), is kept in its pristine purity, then it will remain that invaluable gem, whose worth will never be exceeded by this entire world and whatever it contains.

CHAPTER FIVE

Is there any benefit in bid'ah which is substantiated by proofs?

There may be in this world such a thing which, notwithstanding its harms, does not contain any benefit. The Qur`aan Majeed mentioned regarding great evils of alcohol and gambling, *"There is in both of them great sin and (some) benefit for man."* [Surah Baqarah, Ruku 27]

We accept that there is sin in these acts, but in the same verse, Allaah Ta`ala also states their having some benefits. However, these little benefits do not outweigh the great

harms they present, and these harms render such acts Haraam and impermissible for all time. In fact, they are amongst the greatest of harms.

Whenever any group had introduced even the worst of bid`ahs, even they had extolled some or the other benefit or goodness for it. They may have also presented some or the other proofs in the name of love for Allaah Ta`ala, Nabi ρ or some pious personality or the other. By the use of some well-known personality they have indulged many people in this practice.

Even the Arab Mushriks had substantiated their totally evil act of idol-worship by averring that it was a means of gaining proximity to Allaah Ta`ala. In this regard, Allaah Ta`ala states in the Qur`aan Majeed, *"We (the Mushriks) do not worship them (idols) except that they bring us closer to Allaah."* [Surah Zumar, Ruku 1]

At another juncture, Allaah Ta`ala says that the Mushrikeen say, *"These (their idols) are our intercessors by Allaah."* [Surah Yunus, Ruku 2]
See, even the Mushrikeen have satiated their conscience and substantiated their vile act of idol worship with some 'valid' proof. And then these same Mushrikeen, in the name of the creed of Ibrahim υ, have introduced the utterly vile and lewd innovation of making Tawaaf of the Kaabah Shareef whilst totally naked. Even their womenfolk would make Tawaaf with only a scant piece of cloth, barely covering their private parts.

An excuse is even cited by them for this extremely vile act, that since they commit countless sins in their normal clothing, how then can they make Tawaaf of Allaah Ta`ala's Pure House in those same clothing? They also aver that by donning clothing, they resemble worldly

people and that this is unsuitable for one making Tawaaf, since it conflicts with the honour and sanctity of Allaah Ta`ala's House. We note in no uncertain terms what Allaah Ta`ala and His Nabi ρ say regarding this warped 'Tasawwuf' of the Mushrikeen. We also know that after the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah in 8 A.H. on the occasion of Hajj, Nabi ρ proclaimed that no one is allowed to make Tawaaf naked. [Bukhaari, vol. 1, page 220]

This is how Nabi ρ terminated a bid'ah which lasted centuries.

Hadhrat Umar bin Abdil Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) has mentioned, *"Amma Ba`ad, I advise you with fear for Allaah Ta'ala, moderation in executing deeds, following the Sunnat of His Nabi ρ, abandoning that which the innovators introduced after the Sunnat. What a felony is it not to introduce a bid`ah in the presence of a Sunnat? Hold on firmly to the Sunnat, because it is a protection and fortress for you, by the order of Allaah Ta`ala. Know! No nation introduces any bid`ah except that a proof (against) or experience of it has passed before. Indeed the Sunnat was introduced by such a personality who discerned its opposite factors, considered them and opted against them. You should also content yourself with those things which the nation (Sahaabah - τ) were pleased with, because they were aware and had insight. They stayed away from bid'ah. They were on the highest pedestal. Therefore if you believe that guidance lies in that which you practice, then it implies that you have surpassed them in excellence."* [Abu Dawood, page 277, vol. 2]

Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) makes abundantly clear that the Sunnat is that Path which was demonstrated to us by Nabi ρ and his Sahaabah τ. That which conflicts the Sunnat, which is bid'ah, had also

passed their gazes and attentions, but they opted not to practice upon it. Whatever proofs the Ahle Bid'ah present to substantiate their innovations, had also existed during those eras, but none of those in that illustrious era had ever opted to practice these accretions. How is it that today, we substantiate bid'ah practices with those proofs which were never opted for during that era, notwithstanding those personalities being aware of them? We should like for ourselves that which they preferred. They were the virtuous ones who were rightly guided. If these innovations are koshered and accepted today, then it implies that we are more pious, intelligent and rightly guided than those personalities (i.e. Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah - τ).

Allaamah Shaatbi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"You will not find any innovator who lays claim to being connected to the Deen, but he will present some or the other Shar`i 'proof' to substantiate his act, and in this way will he concoct according to his desires and whims."* [Al-I`tisaam, vol. 1, page 171]

Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Because every bid`atee (innovator) and deviate substantiates his concocted belief from the Kitaab and Sunnah, in accordance to his concocted desire."* [Maktoobaat, part three, page 8, Maktoob 193]

From these texts we establish that every innovator and deviate who lays claim to being connected to the Deen-e-Islaam, takes consolation in proving and substantiating his innovation with some spurious proof which he concocts from the Shariah. However, his misuse of the Qur`aan Majeed and Sunnah to mislead the masses is a crime. Neither is his understanding correct nor is the proof which he fraudulently presents. These very same proofs which he presents were there and available to the Sahaabah τ,

Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim ajmaeen), but none of them ever practiced that which these deviates do. These customs were never practiced by these luminaries. How then can their baatil beliefs and evil innovations be accepted and established today?

Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh), mentioned the following in refutation of those who denied the existence of taqdeer, *"They (the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Salf-e-Saaliheen), have also recited these Aayaat which you recite, but they have understood its meaning and import whilst you have not. Notwithstanding their recitation of all these Aayaat,* ***they accepted the concept of taqdeer.****"* [Abu Dawood, vol.2, page 278]

The import of this statement is crystal clear in that if the meaning of these Aayaat which they present to substantiate their negation of Taqdeer is as they claim, then these very Aayaat were also available to the personalities of the best of eras. How then is it possible that they did not understand the meaning to be such? Can it be said that you are on Haqq and they (Sahaabah τ, etc.) on baatil?

Hadhrat Shah Abdul Azeez Muhaddith Dehlwi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1239 A.H.] stated, *"The yardstick and criterion for differentiating between Haqq and baatil is the understanding, logic and comprehension of the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). Whatever this group deduced and understood from the acts and statements of Nabi ρ, as long as it cannot be disproved, is waajibul qubool (necessary to follow)…If a bid`atee has adopted any understanding which is contrary to that found in the best of eras, then this understanding of his needs to be inspected. If his specific understanding is in conflict with a Qat`i (absolute) proof from nusoos or Ijma, then this bid`atee will be classified as a kaafir. If this*

understanding of the bid`atee is in conflict with a zanni proof, which is close to certainty, like Akhbaar-e-Mashhoor or Ijma-e-Urfi, then such a bid`atee will be classified as a deviate and not kaafir." [Fataawa Azeezi, vol. 1, page 156]

The following salient points are deduced from the above texts:

1. A bid`atee or deviate does not merely make a claim without presenting some or the other proof to substantiate.
2. The proof that they present is not merely based on logic, but they present from Qur`aan and Ahaadith.
3. However, their understanding of the Qur`aan Majeed and Ahaadith is flawed.
4. The reason is that the very same Qur`aan Majeed and Ahaadith which they present as proof, was also available to the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Salf-e-Saliheen (rahmatullah alayhim) and none of them understood or interpreted as the people of Bid`ah do.
5. The proper and authentic interpretation of the Qur`aan Majeed and Ahaadith is that which the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) presented.
6. If the proof presented by the Bid`atee is contrary to *Daleel-e-Qat'i*, then he is a kaafir, but if it contradicts *Daleel-e-Zanni*, then he is a bid`atee and deviate. In fact, Shah Waliullah (rahmatullah alayh) states that if a person is unfamiliar with the language in which the Qur`aan Majeed was revealed or similarly if he is not au fait with the Tafseer of Rasulullaah ρ, the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim), then it is Haraam for such a person to even delve into the science of tafseer, in the first place. He states, *"I am of the*

> *view that it is Haraam for that person to delve into the science of Tafseer if he is unfamiliar with the language in which the Qur`aan Majeed was revealed, and if he is unwary of the concepts of Shaan-e-Nuzool, naasikh and mansookh, which were all reported from Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim).”* [Hujjatullah Baalighah, vol. 1, page 172]

The support which the Ahle Bid`ah eke out for their practices, is not only not to be found in Tafseer or the lives of Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ, it contradicts all this.

Even if they do present anything from the tafseer or Sunnah, then it is either concocted or some very rare and unique report, which they found somewhere. If they do present some authentic or reliable Tafseer or statement, then its meaning and import is misunderstood by them, and presented falsely.
Imaam Suyooti (rahmatullah alayh) states, *“The various sects amongst the Ahle Bid`ah who have based their spurious beliefs on their weak and whimsical understanding of the Qur`aan Majeed, do not find a corresponding view amongst those of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Salf-e-Saaliheen (rahmatullah alayhim).”*

“The summary of this is that whoever chooses the opposite view of that which is presented by the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) is in grave error, in fact he is a bid’ati, because the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) understood the Tafseer of the Qur`aan Majeed and its meanings best. They have understood it as it ought to be, just as it was revealed to Rasulullaah ρ.” [Tafseer Itqaan, vol.2, page 178]

This is a sign of an erroneous creed which is based on false and unsubstantiated narrations. If the Ahle-Bid'ah understood only this principle, they would have saved themselves from the evil in which they wallow.

CHAPTER SIX

What is to be done if there is doubt as to whether a thing is Sunnah or Bid'ah?

All praise is due to Allaah Ta`ala that in the aforegoing pages the reality and difference between Sunnah and Bid'ah was clarified. However if we assume that a doubt does surface regarding an issue and the laymen cannot distinguish between Sunnah and Bid'ah then the obvious and safest path would be to abandon this act and not approach it. If there is a doubt as to whether a thing is bid'ah, Sunnah, Mustahab or permissible then the safest path is to abandon it altogether. There is consensus amongst the Ulama that this is the safest path to tread. In

this regard Hadhrat Wabista bin Ma'bad τ reports from Rasulullaah ρ, *"A sin is that which agitates your nafs and places your heart in doubt. Even though people (*even 'muftis'*) give you a ruling."* [Ahmed/Darmi/Mishkaat, vol.1, page 242]

Hadhrat Attiyah Assa'di τ states, *"Rasulullaah ρ said, 'None of you will ever reach the state of piety, until such time that he abandons those things in which there is no harm, because then he will become a means to those things in which there is harm.'"* [Tirmidhi / Ibn Majah / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 242]

Nabi ρ said to Hadhrat Ma'aaz τ when he deputed him as a governor to Yemen, *"… Without having knowledge, you should never make any decision or ruling. If you are presented with any issue wherein there is doubt, then do not decide until the matter becomes clear or you have written to me."* [Ibn Majah, page 6]

Hadhrat Nu`maan bin Basheer τ [passed away 64 A.H.] reports that Nabi ρ said, *"Halaal is clear and Haraam is clear. Between these two there are things which are doubtful, of which many people are unaware. The person who saves himself from these doubtful things has saved his Deen and honour and whosoever indulges in them, then (it is as if) he has indulged in Haraam. Just like the animal that grazes on the edge of the pasture, soon it will trespass."* [Bukhaari, vol. 1, page 13 / Ibn Majah, page 296]

It is crystal clear from these narrations that the only saviour of one's Imaan and honour insofar as matters of doubt are concerned is to abandon them and not involve oneself in them. One should not destroy one's everlasting existence by indulging in doubtful acts. One should

especially save oneself from indulging in acts which lead to kufr, bid`ah and deviation. In fact, Nabi ρ has expressly stated that one should avoid doubtful things. In this regard, Hadhrat Hasan bin Ali τ [passed away 50 A.H.] stated that Nabi ρ said, *"Leave that in which there is doubt for that wherein there is no doubt, because in goodness there is contentment and in evil, doubt."* [Mustadrak, vol. 2, page 12]

This Hadith also makes it abundantly clear that it is necessary to abandon all such things wherein there is doubt. The entire life of our beloved Nabi ρ is before us, wherein there is not the slightest scope of doubt (i.e. everything is clear). Following the Sunnah lifestyle is sufficient to grant us peace ad contentment. Acting to its contrary leads to darkness and deviation.

It is clearly stated in one Hadith that Nabi ρ loved beginning things from his right. With regard to this, Hadhrat Abdullaah ibn Mas'ood τ said, *"None of you should leave any portion of his Salaat for shaitaan. Upon completing your Salaat on your left, do not make it binding upon yourself to turn around (only) to the right, because I witnessed Rasulullaah ρ also turning to his left side."* [Agreed Upon Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 78]

In commenting on this Hadith, the famous Muhaqqiq, Allamah Muhammad Taahir Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 986 A.H.] stated, *"That person who insists upon a Mandoob or Mustahab act such that he makes it binding and never wavers from it, then it is as though shaitaan has placed him on the road of deviation. What is the condition of that person who persists on bid`ah and evil."* [Majma`ul Bahaar, vol. 244]

The same views are shared by Allamah Teebi Al-Hanafi [passed away 743 A.H.] in the *Sharah* of *Mishkaat* and Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayhima) in *Mirkaat* [page 353, vol. 2], which **clearly proves that whosoever persists on Mandoob or Mustahab, such that they never practice against it, are under shaitaan's influence, and he shares a part of their deed.** Allamah Barkali Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 981 A.H.] writes, *"Know that to execute an act of Bid`ah is worse than omitting a Sunnah. The proof is that the Fuqahaa (rahmatullah alayh) have stated that if a doubt occurs between any act being either Sunnah or Bid`ah, then it is necessary to omit such an act."*

It is stated in Fatawa Aalamgiri, *"That which hangs between (being) Sunnah or Bid`ah must be abandoned."* [Aalamgiri, vol. 1, page 179]

Allamah Shaami (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"If any issue hinges between being (either) Sunnah or bid`ah, then to abandon a Sunnah is preferable to executing a bid`ah."* [Shaami, vol. 1, page 200]

Qaadhi Ebrahim Saheb Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"That thing in which there is a doubt between it being either a Sunnah or bid`ah, should be abandoned, because it is necessary to abandon bid`ah and it is not incumbent to practice upon a Sunnah."* [Nafaaisul Azhaar, Tarjuma Majaalisul Abraar, page 129]

In fact, Allamah Ibn Nujaim Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"It is necessary to abandon that Waajib act, just as is with a Sunnah, if there appears a doubt between it and a bid`ah."* [Bahrur Raa`iq, vol. 2, page 165]

This text makes it abundantly clear that if by executing an act from the angle of it being a Sunnah, but a bid'ah necessarily results from it, then it becomes necessary to abandon that act altogether. That Sunnah will be omitted because it gives rise to a bid'ah. Leave alone Sunnah acts, if this applies to even Waajib acts, then they too should be abandoned. This is done so as not to spread and propagate a bid'ah. Bid`ahs are so abhorred in Islam that they are not be offered any leeway at all. **In order to prevent a bid'ah from being propagated and spread, Sunnah, Mustahab and even Waajib acts are sacrificed!**

O readers! If you understand properly the meaning of obedience to Allaah Ta`ala and if you love Nabi ρ, then there is only one path to follow --- that is the Sunnah of Nabi ρ, and to tread the footsteps of the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). Adopt those beliefs and practices which they adhered to. It should not be that you are as the words of Hadhrat Abdullaah ibn Umar τ state (which in reality are the words of Nabi ρ), that you gather in the Masjid and are deprived of Imaan, *"Such a time will dawn on people where they will gather in the Musaajid, whilst they are devoid of Imaan."* [Mustadrak, vol. 4, page 443]

This is that very same Ibn Umar τ who walked out of a Masjid because they practiced *tathweeb*. In summary, even the smallest of acts is beneficial if executed with sincerity and in accordance to the Sunnah. On the other hand, even the greatest of deeds which is carried out whilst the heart accommodates *shirk* and bid'ah, means nothing in the Sight of Allaah Ta`ala.

May Allaah Ta`ala grant us all sincerity of intentions and proper following of the Sunnah.

CHAPTER SEVEN

This chapter deals with each individual act of bid'ah which the people of the opposite camp perpetrate, and which they doggedly adhere to.

The celebration of Meelaad

There exists not the slightest bit of doubt that love and affection for Nabi ρ is the very essence of Imaan. His ρ very existence, from birth to demise, his every phase of life, speech, actions, etc. was a means of the descending of Allaah Ta'ala's mercy. It is an obligatory duty of every Muslim to learn about and be aware of the lifestyle of Nabi

ρ. There is not a single moment, neither any month of the year, nor day of the month, nor any hour of the day, nor any second of the hour, where extolling the praises of Nabi ρ or speaking about his life, is impermissible. This issue is no point of contention. However, we need to study whether the 12th of Rabiul Awwal can be specified to celebrate Meelaad, or to stipulate an occasion for gatherings or feeding the poor, etc. Have all these occasions been established from Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ? **If they are established from the best of eras then no Muslim has the right to object, because whatever has been practiced or advocated in those eras are part of the Deen.** To oppose and contradict it would then be tantamount to irreligiousness. Nabi ρ remained amongst his people for 23 years after Nubuwwat, and then 30 years thereafter was the reign of the Khilaafat-e-Raashidah, and the era of the Sahaabah τ remained until 110 Hijri. **The era of the Tabieen and Tabe-Tabieen existed for ± 220 years.** Love and affection (for Nabi ρ was perfect in all these personalities. They had profound and extreme love and affection. Who is there that can exceed them in respecting and honouring Nabi ρ? If the people of the opposite camp (Ahle-Bid'ah) can prove that they exceed the personalities of the best of eras, then none can object to them (and their practices). However, if they cannot prove it, and right until Qiyaamah they will never be able to do it, then the question arises that notwithstanding the reasons and motivations having existed during the best of eras, yet those personalities did not adhere to or initiate the practices in vogue presently? And yet today these (bid'ah) practices have become worthy of reward! The very same rewards extolled by the proponents of bid'ah could easily have been acquired by the Salf-e-Saaliheen, yet they did not practice it. They should realize one simple fact that whatever Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the personalities of the best of eras practiced – *that* was Deen.

This much should be remembered that the occasion and gathering of Meelaad is one thing and extolling, lauding and speaking about Nabi ρ is another. The first is a bid'ah whereas the latter is praiseworthy and Mustahab. In this regard Maulana Rashid Ahmed Gangohi Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1323 AH] said, *'The actual extolling of Wilaadat (birth of Nabi ρ is praiseworthy. It will become Makrooh if conditions are attached to it.'* [Fataawah Rashidiyyah, vol.1 page 102]

He further states, *'It is a Mustahab to extol the Wilaadat (birth) of Nabi ρ, however due to the attachment of various conditions this gathering is now prohibited.'* [vol. 1 page 110]
If an intellectual person cannot understand the difference between the simple extolling of Wilaadat and the gatherings of Meelaad, then we have no cure for him.

The date for Meelaad gathering

After a full six centuries in Islamic history, this bid'ah features nowhere as a custom amongst Muslims. This was neither the practice of any Sahaabi, nor Tabiee nor Muhaddith nor Faqhi nor saint nor wali. This practice was the brainchild of an extravagant king and his materially-inclined Molvi companion. This bid'ah was initiated in Mosul in 604 A.H. by the instruction of Muzaffarud Deen Kokri bin Arbal [passed away 630 A.H.], who was an extravagant and unconcerned about the Deen (see Ibn Khalkaan, etc). Imaam Ahmad bin Muhammad Misri Maaliki (rahmatullah alayh) writes *"He was an extravagant king. He used to tell the Ulama of his time that he makes his own research and Ijtihaad, and that he does*

not follow the Math-hab of others. A group of (worldly) ulama started to incline towards him. He used to specify the practice of Meelaad in Rabiul Awwal. He was the first amongst the kings who initiated this innovation." [Alqowlul Mu`tamid fi Amalil Moulid]

This extravagant king squandered large sums of money from the Baitul Maal on this innovation. He also succeed in winning over the support of the simple folk, by this camouflaged 'deeni' practice. He wasted much of the people's money on this.

In this regard, Allamah Zahabi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 748 A.H.] states, *"He would squander three hundred thousand, every year on these Moulood celebrations."* [Dowlul Islaam, vol. 2, page 103]

The irreligious Molvi who was instrumental in coercing this king to initiate these celebrations, was one Umar bin Wahya Abul Khitaab [passed away 633 A.H.]. Hark now at the comments regarding this 'hadhrat'. Haafidh Ibn Hajar Asqalaani (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"He used to assail and disparage the Aimmah and Salf-e-Saaliheen. He was foul-tongued. He was haughty and a fool. He showed scant regard and concern for Deeni matters."* [Lisaanul Mezaan, vol. 4, page 296]

He states further, *"Ibn Najjaar says, 'I have found numerous people unanimous on his falsities and weaknesses."* [vol. 4, page 295]

Dear readers! You have now seen that the initiator of this innovation of Meelaad was a wasteful and extravagant king, who would encourage the people to follow his ijtihaad instead of the pious predecessors. He preyed on the simple-minded and used their Deeni enthusiasm to score

political points. He found some back-street Molvi to consent to and bless this innovation of his, who himself was a foul-tongued, haughty, inane miscreant who assailed the honour of the Salf-e-Saaliheen. This molvi was very lazy insofar as Deeni practices were concerned. Many a pitiable Sufis, whose Deeni insight was extremely shallow, joined with this cunning king and shrewd Molvi, in this practice. When this king, his wayward Molvi and the simple Sufis, gave consent to and engaged in this innovation, what were the masses to do? What good would their appeals and objections hold? Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Mubaarak (rahmatullah alayh) states,

"And who despoils the Deen, besides the king
The evil priests and his dervishes."

Now the choice is whether to follow the Sunnah of the personalities of the best of the eras or that of the whimsical king and his wayward molvi? We will certainly opt for following the Sunnah of the best of eras. May Allaah Ta`ala grant us taufeeq. The Ulama-e-Haqq and Ahle Haqq in every era have opposed and rejected this Meelaad celebration. Refer to the Fatwa of Sheikhul Islaam Ibn Taimiyya, vol. 1, page 312, Imaam Naseerud Deen Ash-Shaafi's *Irshaadul Akhyaar*, page 20 and Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf Thaani Hanafi's *Maktoob*, part 5, page 22. Allamah Ibn Ameerul Haaj Maaliki (rahmatullah alayh) vehemently opposes this innovation, and states, *"As for those bid`ahs and innovations which people regard as great acts of Ibaadat and which they regard the perpetration as being a sign of Islaam, amongst which is the gathering of Meelaad which is celebrated in the month of Rabiul Awwal. The reality is that this practice comprises many bid`ahs and untoward practices… amongst the evils of this practice is 'Sima`'. Even if the gatherings of Meelaad are free of Sima` and they are held purely with*

the intention of Moulood, preparing food and inviting friends and associates, and it is free of all other evils, ***then too it will be a bid'ah purely because of the intention of Moulood*** *(i.e. celebrating the birth of Nabi ρ). This is an innovation which is added to the Deen that was not amongst the Salf-e-Saaliheen. It is by far better and meritorious to follow in the footsteps of the Aslaaf."* [Mudkhal Ibn Alhaaj, vol.1 page 85]

Allaamah Abdurrahmaan Maghribi (rahmatullah alayh) states in his fatwa, *"Indeed the practice of Moulood is a bid'ah. Neither did Rasulullaah ρ nor the Khulafaa τ nor the Aimmah exhort or practice it."*

Allaamah Ahmed bin Muhammad Misri Maaliki (rahmatullah alayh) states regarding the celebrations of Meelaad, *"Indeed the Ulama of all four Mathaahib have unanimously censured this practice."*

Dear respected readers you have by now discerned the reality of this mas'alah by studying the above citations, that this practice did not exist during the Khairul-Quroon, rather it was initiated after the sixth century. You have also come to know of this condition and state of its initiators. The king of that era initiated this accretion and the masses meekly and obediently followed. The deeply far sighted personality, Imaam Jalaaluddeen Suyooti Misri (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 911 A.H.] mentioned, *"There is no nass (text) on its permissibility, only Qiyaas."*

This is a clear and explicit admission that there is no nass for the permissibility of Meelaad in neither the Qur'aan Majeed nor Hadith Shareef nor Ijma'. There is however, Qiyaas. One is the Qiyaas is *faasid* (spurious) and secondly if there existed the reason and motivation for this act during the Khairul Quroon, then the question of Qiyaas

does not arise and it will not be permissible to make it at all. Molvi Abdus Samee' Saheb, had **listed at least 73** names of persons, whom he claims had blessed the practice of Meelaad [Anwaarus Saatia, pages 248-250]. **However, he has not contemplated on the fact that no name of Sahaabah τ or Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) is listed therein. There is also no mention of any of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahiddeen or Muhadditheen.** He has also not considered that most of the names mentioned by him are those **of Sufiya, whose practice is not proof in the Shariah, according to Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh).** Of the few Muhaqqiq Ulama he has listed, they have fallen into the trap of the *Qiyaas-e-Faasid*. Some of those he mentioned only used to feed poor people on that day, and others regarded the actual extolling of the birth of Nabi ρ as meritorious and others merely regarded it as the expression of one's happiness.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan cites from Hadhrat Haaji Imdaadullah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1317 A.H.], where he states in his treatise *Haft Mas`alah* on page 8 that Meelaad is permissible and worthy of merit. [Jaa al Haqq, page 227]

However, Mufti Saheb should be made aware that the treatise *Haft Mas`alah* is not written by the pen of Hadhrat Haji Saheb. This was written by Hadhrat Moulana Ashraf Ali Thaanwi Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1363 A.H.]. the subject matter may be Haji Saheb's but the actual text is that of Hadhrat Thaanwi Saheb. [See Fataawa Rashidiyya, vol. 1, page 101]. Hadhrat Moulana Ashraf Ali Thaanwi (rahmatullah alayh) was in favour of its permissibility in the initial stages of his life. He later retracted from this view. The actual words of Hadhrat Haaji Saheb was that the actual extolling (of the praises of

Nabi ρ) is meritorious, but the conditions attached thereto are bid'ah. [Ibid, page 102]

And then too, those accretions which were customary amongst the people (engaging in these acts) were not known to him. [See Fataawa Rashidiyya, vol. 1, page 101]

And then also, Hadhrat Haaji Saheb (his statements and actions) is no proof in the Shariah. Therefore, to mention the name of Hadhrat Haaji Saheb insofar as Shar'i Masaa`il are concerned (as proof) is futile and superfluous [Fataawa Rashidiyya, vol. 1, page 98].

The extraordinary proof of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan

He states that this celebration is also held with utmost due consideration in the Haramain Shareefain. In whichever country you go to, Muslims practice upon it. The Ulama and Auliyaa have extolled great benefits and blessings for it. He finally avers that the celebration of Meelaad is Mustahab. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 224]
On page 227, he states, *"For (an act) to be regarded as Mustahab, only this much is sufficient that the Muslims regard it as good."*

Reply

How is it that these same virtues and blessings never occurred to the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen, Tabe Tabieen, Aimmah-e-Mujtahiddeen, Auliyaa of Allaah Ta`ala and the Ulama of the Ummat? How is it that these personalities were all deprived of this customary 'blessed' gathering? Also, how is it that this practice was non-existent for the first six centuries of Islaam? Undoubtedly, the mentioning of the Haramain Shareefain warrants great consideration, however, the proofs of the Shariah are only four. If a

virtuous act is enacted in the Haramain, then *noorun ala noor*, otherwise it is no proof in the Shariah. In this regard, Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Oppression is carried out in the Haramain Shareefain, ignorance abounds there, there is a scarcity of knowledge, evil is being manifest, innovations becoming common and Haraam and doubtful foods is being consumed."* [Mirqaat, vol. 3, page 271]

The ruling of Mufti Saheb is also worthy of envy that for any act to be classified as Mustahab, it is sufficient that the people regard it as good. A loophole is being sought to spread, propagate and legalize bid`ah. It seems to have been overlooked that a Mustahab is a great thing. Permissibility is also a Shar`i ruling and without the consent of Nabi ρ by either speech or action, it cannot be established. This detailed discussion with proofs has been discussed already. There is no need to repeat. Allamah Shaami (rahmatullah alayh) states, ***"Being Mustahab is a Shar`i ruling, which necessitates proof."*** [Raddul Mukhtaar].

Making Qiyaam (standing) in Meelaad

It will be permissible to make Qiyaam (stand) for a pious personality if he arrives in person, provided there is no exaggeration and it is within the limits. This has been proven by Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) and others via the Hadith of, *"Stand towards your leader."* [Sharah Muslim, vol. 2, page 95]

Some other personalities regard the import of this Hadith in the context that Hadhrat Sa`ad bin Ma`aaz τ was injured and Nabi ρ mentioned this in order for others to help him alight from his conveyance. In this regard it is stated in Musnad Ahmad, *"Stand towards your leader and (help)*

him alight from the donkey." This is the reason why Nabi ρ used the word *Ilaa* (towards) and not *li* (for).

However we need to study what the Sahaabah τ did on the occasion. And also to see what Nabi ρ preferred or disliked on such occasions. Hadhrat Anas τ states, *"There was none more beloved than Rasul ρ to them (Sahaabah τ), however when they met him, they would not stand (in respect for him), because they knew his dislike for this."* [Tirmidhi Shareef, vol. 2, page 100 / Mishkaat, vol. 2, page 403 / Musnad Ahmad, vol. 3, page 151]

From this authentic Hadith we ascertain that Nabi ρ did not like anyone to stand (out of respect) for him and also that notwithstanding the profound and excessive love and respect the Sahaabah τ had for him ρ, **they did not stand for him.** It is indeed strange, nay astonishing, that the very act which Nabi ρ detested in his presence, and which the Sahaabah τ, notwithstanding their great respect and awe for him, did not carry out in his very presence, is today being perpetrated in these Meelaad gatherings, under the guise of it being permissible and Mustahab, when there is no proof or even indication that he ρ is present there.

In fact, they even regard this Qiyaam as Waajib and Fardh, and further than that, they pass the ruling of kufr on anyone not making Qiyaam there. Molvi Abdus Samee' Saheb, claims, *"Qiyaam is Waajib on the occasion of the Meelaad ρ."* [Anwaarus Saatia, page 250]

Just see the naïve comment of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan when he avers, *"This is a slander against the Muslims when it is claimed that they regard Qiyaam at Meelaad as Waajib. No Aalim of the Deen has ever written that Qiyaam is Waajib, neither was it ever mentioned in any*

Bayaan. Even the masses agree that Qiyaam and Meelaad are worthy of reward. How then can you claim that (we understand it) as Waajib?" [Jaa-al Haqq, page 245]

Mufti Saheb! Kindly refer to the text of Anwaarus Saatia and gauge for yourself whether this is a slander or reality. Not merely Waajib, it is regarded as Fardh! And to top it, those who do not participate therein are branded kaafir. It is stated in the famous Fatwa Kitaab of the Ahle Bid`ah, *Ghaayatul Muraam*, on pages 55, 56, 67 and 71 that Nabi ρ presents himself at the gatherings of Meelaad, and that it is Fardh to stand in respect for him. It also states that he who does not stand is a kaafir.

Mullah Nizaamud Deen Multaani Barelwi states in *Jaamiul Fataawa*, on page 416, vol. 15 that in the gathering of Meelaad, to make Qiyaam is preferred and Mustahab. Also that in a way it is Waajib.

To celebrate Urs

It is regarded as amongst the noble deeds to have good thoughts of and affection for the pious personalities of the Deen. To follow in their footsteps and properly adhere to their teachings is a means for salvation. After their demise, to make *Isaal-e-Thawaab* for them within the framework of the Shariah and to supplicate for their raising in ranks, are amongst the praiseworthy acts. If one happens to pass by the grave of a pious person, then to present oneself there and make dua for him and make salaam in accordance to the Sunnah, is correct and permissible. However, to traverse long distances in order to visit the graves, is a debatable issue amongst the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat. Those who oppose this present the Hadith of *"Do*

not saddle your conveyance (i.e. travel) except to the three Musaajid…"

When Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ returned from visiting Toor, the narrator of this Hadith, Hadhrat Basra bin Abi Basra Al-Ghaffaari τ forbade travelling to Toor by quoting this Hadith in support. He said, *"O Abu Hurairah, if I had met you before you undertook the journey to Toor, then based on this Hadith, I would certainly have forbade you from going."* [Nisai, vol. 1, page 160]

Hadhrat Shah Waliullah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh), writes using this Hadith as proof, *"The truth in my opinion, (travelling to) visit the grave of any Wali or the Toor, all fall within the ambit of the same prohibition."* [Hujjatullahil Baalighah, vol. 1, page 192]

In fact, he states that if anyone goes to Ajmer to the graves of Hadhrat Khwaja Chisti (rahmatullah alayh), Hadhrat Saalaar Mas`ood Ghaazi (rahmatullah alayh) or any other such pious personality, in order to fulfil some need of his, then the sin of this act is greater than the perpetration of murder and adultery. [Tafheemaat-e-Ilaahi, vol. 2, page 45]

It is most certainly not established in the Shariah to specify a day or to gather at the gravesites. Those specific dates which are stipulated each year, called *Urs* are completed unsubstantiated in the Shariah. Nabi ρ stated, *"Do not make my grave a place of Eid (i.e. place of gathering and congregation)."* [Nisai / Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 1, page 86]

The commentators of the Hadith have given various explanations regarding the meaning of this Hadith. For example, *"You should not gather at the grave for visiting, as you would (normally) gather for Eid."*

This type of gathering is precisely what occurs at *Urs*, which is what Nabi ρ prohibited. Another objective is, *"It means that people come to the grave of Nabi ρ in large numbers, such that they make it like the occasion of Eid which comes once a year."* [Mirqaat/Mishkaat, vol.1 page 86]

Urs is also celebrated annually which is in opposition to the Hadith. When it is not permissible to make *Urs* at the gravesite of Nabi ρ, then how can it be allowed at any other grave? Hadhrat Shah Waliullah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"I say regarding the Hadith, 'Do not make my grave a place of Eid', that it is a means of preventing Tahreef (changing in the Deen), just as the Christians and Jews have perpetrated where they made the graves of their Ambiyaa υ seasonal venues of festivity."* [Hujjatullahil Baalighah, vol.2, page 77]

Just as the days for Hajj are fixed and stipulated, in exactly the same manner the Jews and Christians have done for visiting the graves of the Ambiyaa υ. Mashaa-Allah Ta`ala! Leaving aside the graves of the Ambiyaa υ, what the Muslims have done to the graves (nay mausoleums) of the Auliyaa-e-Kiraam (rahmatullah alayhim) would even make the Jews and Christians shy. He states further, *"Amongst the great acts of bid`ah are the great excesses which the people have perpetrated at the gravesites and made them venues of festivity."* [Tafheemaat-e-Ilaahi, vol.2, page 64]

Qaadhi Thanaaullah Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"That which the ignoramuses do with the gravesites of the Auliya and Shuhadaa is impermissible. They prostrate there, circumambulate around them, place lamps thereupon, perform Sajdah towards them and gather their*

annually for a festival, which is called Urs." [Tafseer Mazhari, vol.2 page 65]

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes that by stipulating the date for *Urs* makes it expedient and easy for the masses that they know when to gather. When the people do gather, they recite Qur`aan Majeed, Kalimah Tayyibah, Durood, etc., which is a means of great blessings. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 309]

This notation of his is not even worth any substance. Sheikh Ali Muttaqi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"To gather for recitation of the Qur`aan Majeed upon a deceased, specifically at the gravesite, or Masjid or home is a malevolent bid`ah."* [Risaala Radd-e-Bid`ah]

Now the remains the issue where Molvi Abdus Samee' and Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan cite some Ahaadith in substantiation for their actions. Amongst them is the one where it is stated that annually, Nabi ρ would recite some dua with the words *'Assalaamualaikum'* at the graves of the martyrs, and the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen also did something similar to this. This 'proof' of theirs is unbaked for the following reasons:

Firstly, this narration is of such a nature that it is not accepted by the Muhadditheen, neither for *Aqeedah* nor practice. [See *Ujalaa-e-Naafi'a, page 7*, and Hujjatullaah]

Secondly, these narrations do not mention any gathering, neither do they mention recitation of Qur`aan Majeed or sermons being delivered, etc. in short, they cannot be used as a proof for the festivals of *Urs*, neither *Naqlan (narrative)* nor *Aqlan (logic).*

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan states, *"It is stated in Fataawa Rashidiyya, vol. 1, under the section of Hadhar wal Ibaahat, page 59, that there exists a difference of opinion amongst the Ulama of the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat regarding visiting the graves of the Auliyaa. Some say it is permissible and others say it is not. Both groups are from the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat. It is not permissible to make it a contentious issue…*

Now it is not correct for any Deobandi to prevent one from travelling for Urs, because Molvi Rasheed Ahmad Saheb has prohibited from making it contentious…" [Jaa-al Haqq, page 318]

It is merely the hopeful wish of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan that Hadhrat Moulana Gangohi Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) has consented to travelling for *Urs*.

Moulana Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) had presented this Mas`alah thus: *"Answer: There is a difference of opinion regarding travelling to visit the graves of the pious. Some Ulama consent and others object. This is a mas`alah with a difference of opinion. One should not make it a bone of contention, however, to regard the day of Urs as ziyaarat is Haraam."* [Fataawa Rashidiyya, part 2, page. 29]

Now tell us. Does nay Deobandi have the right to prevent from *Urs* or not?

We had first cited the reference of Hadhrat Shah Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) and Qaadhi Thanaaullah (rahmatullah alayh), wherein they have stated that to stipulate a day for visiting the graves and to celebrate *Urs* is a bid`ah. Qaadhi Saheb has referred to it as Haraam and a Makrooh. The statements of Hadhrat Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) are in much the same light. The senior

Peer of Molvi Ahmad Raza Khaan Barelwi, Hadhrat Shah Hamza Sahib Marharwi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1165 A.H.] had made the bequest that Faatiha not be made (for him). [Anwaarul A'arifeen, page 469]

Now have a look at this! Even the *Peer* of the Barelwis has demonstrated unison with this ruling.

Loud Thikr

The thikr of Allaah Ta`ala is one great act of ibaadat. To make dua (supplicate) is also a noble deed and means of gaining proximity to Allaah Ta`ala. However, all this has to be done in the manner which the Shariah has ordained. Wherever the Shariah has ordained that thikr be made loudly, like on the days of *Tashreeq* or the *Talbiya* of Hajj, then it will be Sunnah to make it loudly on these occasions. However, where the Shariah has not ordained thikr be made loudly, then on those occasions it is best to make is softly. In this way will the object of the Shariah be fulfilled. The same ruling applies to dua.

Although Saahibain (Imaams Abu Yusuf and Muhammad) had preferred that on some occasions thikr be made loudly, and Imaam Ibn Hazam (rahmatullah alayh) and other Sufiya had preferred on most occasions that Thikr be made loudly, they all, nonetheless, never censured those who did not do so, or ever called them 'Wahaabis'. Nevertheless, if we cast a glance at the proofs, then the truth of the matter is that the best form for thikr and dua is that it be made softly. This is the view and opinion of Imaams Abu Hanifah, Shaafi', Maalik and Ahmad bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayhim). When all the four Imaams are unanimous on the same ruling, then one can be pretty certain that the Haqq is on their side.

If nowadays, loud thikr is preferred and practiced and on the other hand silence is maintained regarding the opposite view, that is one issue, but the moot point of contention here is that those who do not participate in loud thikr are branded as 'Wahaabis', etc., etc. and vile epithets are being hurled. Nowadays, people only regard you as a Muslim and part of the Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat if you participate in loud thikr. If you join in then you are a Sunni, otherwise you are a 'wahaabi'. It is for this reason that this Mas'alah requires further dilation and study. We will briefly present some proofs.

Allaah Ta`ala states, *"And make Thikr of your Rabb in your hearts, humbly, with fear and without loudness in speech."*[Para 9, Surah A'raaf, Aayat 24]

Elsewhere, Allaah Ta`ala says, *"Call unto your Rabb with humility and fear. Indeed He does not love those who transgress the limits."* [Para 8, Surah A'raaf, ruku 7]

In these noble Aayaat, there are two conditions for thikr and dua. One is that thikr and dua be made with utmost sincerity, humility, modesty and meekness, and the second is that it be made with softness, because Allaah Ta`ala does not love those who transgress the limits. Nabi ρ once came across some Sahaabah τ making thikr loudly. On that occasion he admonished them saying, *"O People! Have mercy on your souls. Indeed you are not calling out to a deaf one neither to one who is not present. Indeed you are calling out to The One Who Listens and is close by. He is with you."* [Bukhaari, vol. 2, page 605 / Muslim, vol. 2, page 346]

From this narration we realise that Nabi ρ preferred soft thikr by preventing them from making loud thikr. In this regard, Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"In this*

narration (is proof) for it being Mustahab to lower the voice with thikr, as long as there is no need to raise it." [Sharah Muslim, vol. 2, page 346]

Haafidh Ibn Katheer (rahmatullah alayh) states that Imaam Ibn Hazam Zaahiri (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 456 A.H.], etc. regarded as Mustahab the recitation of loud thikr after Salaat, but, *"Ibn Battaal (rahmatullah alayh) said that the ruling of the four Math-habs is to the contrary (i.e. that it is not Mustahab)."* [Al Bidaaya wan Nihaaya, vol. 1, page 270/ Also in Haashiya of Bukhaari, vol. 1, page 116]

The proof of Imaam Ibn Hazam (rahmatullah alayh) and others lays in the narration of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Abbaas τ, *"Indeed raising of the voices in thikr upon completion of Fardh Salaat was in vogue amongst the people during the era of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)."* [Muslim, vol. 1, page 217]

Hadhrat Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh), explains this narrations thus, *"Ibn Battaal and others have narrated that the Aimmah of the Math-habs, which most people follow (i.e. the four Imaams) and others also, are unanimous that it is not Mustahab to make loud thikr and Takbeer. Imaam Shaafi' (rahmatullah alayh) explains this narration of Ibn Abbaas τ thus that the loud thikr was only made for a short duration of time, in order to teach the masses. It was not done perpetually."* [Sharah Muslim, vol. 1, page 217]

This view appears most correct and balanced. If this was not the case, then it would most certainly have been the constant practice of all the Sahaabah τ to make loud thikr, and also a high-ranking Sahaabi like Ibn Mas'ood τ would not have castigated the group of people making loud thikr in the Masjid and he would not have told them that they

are brining darkness upon the Ummat right in the midst and presence of the Sahaabah τ of Nabi ρ, by introducing this bid`ah. This loud recitation was done by Nabi ρ as a means of teaching the Sahaabah τ, just like he would recite 'Bismillah' loudly, to teach them. These acts were not carried out subsequently. To perpetuate these practices is bid`ah, as reported by Ibn Mughaffal τ. Similar is the case with the mas'alah of loud thikr. Allamah Halbi Hanafi writes, *"It is reported from Abu Hanifah that to raise the voice in thikr is bid`ah, which is in diametric opposition to the Aayat of Allaah Ta'ala, 'Call unto your Rabb…'"* [Kabeeri, page 566]

It is abundantly clear from this text that it is the view of Imaam A'zam (rahmatullah alayh) that to make thikr loudly is both, in conflict with the Aayat of Allaah Ta`ala and also a bid`ah. It is indeed a shame that the perpetrators of this bid`ah label others 'Wahaabi', and that they deem loud thikr as a sign of the Ahle Sunnah. *Laa Howla Wa Laa Quwwata*.

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It has been reported from some of our Ulama that to raise the voice in the Masjid, even if it be for thikr, is Haraam."* [Mirqaat, vol. 2, page 470]

You have noted that Imaam Ibn Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) regards loud thikr as a bid`ah, and that it has been reported from Mullah Ali Qaari as being Haraam. However, Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan avers, *"The opposition say it (loud thikr) is Haraam, and they employ various tactics to prevent it. One of their ploys is to say that loud thikr is a bid`ah, that it is contrary to the principles of the Hanafis…"* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 329]

Let us now be fair—who exactly has referred to it as being a bid`ah and Haraam? Do you now brand Imaam A'zam and Mullah Ali Qaari also as part of your opposition? Are they also amongst those who employ various tactics to prevent loud thikr? Come to your senses and give an unbiased reply.

Imaam Nawawi writes, *"There is no difference of opinion that dua be made softly."* [Sharah Muslim, vol. 1, page 311]

Imaam Sirajuddeen Hanafi and Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) state, *"Softness is Mustahab in dua, and to raise the voice in dua is a bid`ah."* [Fataawa Siraajia, page 72 / Moudo'aat-e-Kabeer, page 17]

All these references are as clear as daylight insofar as their import is concerned. This view is the better one and closer to the spirit of the Shariah.

Now remains the one reference made by Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan which he cites from Shaami that, *"The Mutaqaddimeen and Muta-akhireen are unanimous that it is Mustahab for a group to make loud thikr in a Masjid, provided it does not disturb one who is sleeping, performing Salaat or reciting Qur`aan Majeed."*[Jaa-al Haqq, page 332]

This is most certainly not worth paying any attention to, because firstly, when the Qur`aan Majeed and Hadith Shareef have explicitly forbidden loud thikr, then can the action and statement to the contrary of any person be used as a proof? Secondly, all four Imaams of Fiqh have stated that loud Thikr is not Mustahab and Imaam Saheb has labelled it a bid`ah. He also further states that this is contrary to the explicit Command of Allaah Ta`ala. When

all four Imaams are unanimous on the impermissibility of loud thikr, how then can there be unanimity on its permission? Are the Aimmah-e-Arba'a not amongst the Mutaqaddimeen?

Thirdly, even the Ulama-e-Muta'akhireen are not unanimous on loud thikr being Mustahab. The Ulama of all four Math-habs have objected to it. Even the Sufiya are not unanimous regarding it. Look at the Maktoobaat of Mujaddid Alfe Thaani (rahmatullah alayh). In similar vein study the kitaabs of other Fuqahaa, Ulama and Muhadditheen on this subject. This mas`alah will not be resolved unless one studies it with an open an unbiased mind.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan citing from Sheikh Muhammad Saheb Thaanwi (rahmatullah alayh), *"Nabi ρ would recite Tasbeeh and Tahleel in a loud voice, after Salaat, with the Sahaabah τ."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 330]

This proof is also not very weighty, because, firstly, if this narration cannot be proven to be authentic via the normal channels of Hadith Usools, how then can it be used as a proof? Secondly, if it can be proven to be authentic, then too, we can present the explanation of Imaam Shaafi' (rahmatullah alayh) which he gave for the narration of Ibn Abbaas τ that this was only done as a means of teaching, and it was only carried out for a limited period and not continuously. If it was done continuously, then the Aimmah-e-Arba`a would never have ruled that loud thikr is not Mustahab. This is an obvious fact, which cannot be disputed.

To solidify (make mausoleums out of) the graves of the Auliyaa and build domes thereupon

It has been clearly stated in the Ahaadith of Nabi ρ that as far as possible, graves should not be desecrated and disrespected, that is, one should not sit on the graves, walk upon them, urinate or defecate on them, change their form, etc. All such acts are prohibited in the Shariah. The grave of a believer is a resting place in the *Aalam-e-Barzakh*, which should be respected, and not desecrated. The question arises as to whether building up of the graves and building solid structures around them and placing domes upon them, is included as respect or not. The answer is simple and straight-forward for any Muslim and level-headed person. The answer is that to build up the graves is not any form of respect neither is it disrespectful not to build up around the graves. If the solidifying of graves and building domes thereupon was a form of respect, and if there was any form of Deeni benefit therein, then our Nabi ρ would most certainly not have prohibited therefrom. If the matter was as is claimed nowadays by the likes of Molvi Abdus Samee', Molvi Muhammad Umar and Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan, etc. that they advocate Deeni benefit therein, and they claim this as permissible and worthy of reward, and at the very least they claim it to be Mustahab, then the question arises as to why Nabi ρ prevented the Muslims from doing such? And why did he ρ deprive the Ummat from these imagined benefits? The fact of the matter is that all the claims of these Ahle Bid`ah in this regard are spurious and baatil. Their claims are not even worthy of the gutters.

Hadhrat Jaabir τ reports, *"Nabi ρ prohibited from solidifying the graves or to build anything thereupon or to sit on them."* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 1, page 312 / Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 1, page 148 / Tirmidhi Shareef, vol. 1, page 125]

The leader of all the worlds, Hadhrat Muhammad Mustafa ρ has expressly prohibited from such actions. Who then is there that can overturn his express prohibition and audaciously claim benefits in what he has prohibited from? Hadhrat Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) comments on this Hadith thus, *"We do not regard it as correct (sensible) that more sand be placed on a grave than what was taken out of it. We regard solidifying grave as Makrooh…because Nabi ρ forbade building four walls around a grave and solidifying it. This is our Math-hab and this is also the view of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh)."* [Kitaabul Aathaar pgs. 96/97]

Has anyone the right to oppose the explicit Hadith of Hadhrat Muhammad ρ? Has any Hanafi attained such a rank that he omits the fatwa of Hadhrat Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) which is based on an authentic Hadith? Remember this view of Imaam Abu Hanifah has been related without any intermediary via his student Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayh), who also held the same view. Just take a look at the ignorance and treachery of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan, that he cites Imaam Shi'raani (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 973AH], reporting from Hadhrat Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) that he said it is permissible to solidify graves and build domes thereupon. Further on he opens up the fort by claiming, *"It is now confirmed that we have found reference of the Imaam of our Math-hab, Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) that it is permissible to build domes on graves."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 274]

Subhaanallaah! A sufi of the 10th century makes an unsubstantiated statement which clearly contradicts the clear Math-hab of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) as reported by Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayh)! This view is of no consequence.

Although, after citing authentic Hadith and the view of Hadhrat Imaam Saheb, there is no need, but we will nevertheless lay bare the actual ruling, in order to completely clarify the matter, by listing the rulings of various Hanafi Fuqaha-e-Kiraam (rahmatullah alayhim).

Allamah Halbi Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It is Makrooh to solidify the graves and to plaster them. This is the ruling of three Imaams…Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) states that to build anything on a grave, like a dome, etc. is Makrooh. The mentioned Hadith is a proof for this."* [Kabeeri, page 599]

Imaam Sirajuddeen Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 700A.H.] writes, *"It is Makrooh to build anything on the grave."* [Fatawa Siraajia, page 24]

Imaam Qaadhi Khaan (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 592 A.H] writes, *"Graves should not be plastered as has been narrated by Nabi ρ, that indeed he has prohibited from solidifying graves, placing pebbles and building around graves."* [Qaadhi Khaan, vol. 1, page 92]
Haafidh Ibn Humaam Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 861 A.H.] writes, *"Indeed Nabi ρ has prohibited building around graves and plastering (solidifying) them."* [Fat-hul Qadeer, vol. 4, page 472]

It is stated in Fataawa Aalamgiri, *"The grave should be heightened to (the size of a) hand-span like a camel's hump, and should not be built up or plastered. It is Makrooh to build on a grave."* [Aalamgiri, Misri print, vol. 1, page 176]

Allamah Ibn Aabideen Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"I am not aware of anyone who has consented to building around graves."* [Shaami, vol. 1, page 101]

Note: The general term 'Makrooh' according to Imaam Abu Hanifah and other Salf-e-Saliheen refers to ***Makrooh-e-Tahrimi***. In this regard, Allamah Abul Makaarim Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 860 A.H.] writes, *"(The term) 'Makrooh' means At-Tahreem (Haraam), according to Imaam Saheb."* Abul Makaarim, vol. 3, page 159]

Nawaab Siddiq Hasan Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"Haafidh Ibn Qayyim (rahmatullah alayh) has explained in I'laamul Muwaqqi'en that in the terminology of the Salf, the usage of the word 'Makrooh' indicates Tahreem (Haraam)."* [Ad-Daleelut Taalib, page 502]

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states in the commentary of the Hadith, *'Whosoever initiates a bid`ah dhalaalah…', "A bid'ah-e-dhalaalah is that which the Aimmah of the Muslims have refuted, like building upon graves and solidifying them."* [Mirqaat, vol. 1, page 246]

From this we gauge that the Ulama-e-Muslimeen have strongly refuted and opposed the building up of graves and solidifying them, such they have branded such acts bid'ah-e-dhalaalah.

Qaadhi Thanaaullah Saheb Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1228 A. H.] writes, *"That which is perpetrated at the graves of the Auliyaa, like building them high and being illuminated by lamps, and other such accretions which take place there are all Haraam."* [Maala Budda Minh, page 95]

This proof is sufficient for any sincere seeker of the truth, as for the stubborn, even floods of proofs would not suffice. As for the citations of Molvi Abdus Samee' and Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan of the likes of Sheikh Abdul Ghani Naablusi, author of *Roohul Bayaan*, Imaam Khaskafi and Tahtawi (rahmatullah alayhim), that it is permissible to build domes, etc. on the graves of the Auliyaa and Ulama, is spurious and baatil. A concise and effective reply to them is that these personalities are neither sinless nor mujtahids. Also who will listen to an opposing view to that of Nabi ρ and the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen? There remains now the claim of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan etc. that are exists narrations to the effect that tents were placed in the graves of Hadhrat Umar and Aishah τ and Hadhrat Muhammad bin Hanafiyya (rahmatullah alayh). Firstly, the reply to this is that these narrations are without origin or sanad, and are most certainly not acceptable. Secondly, even if we assume that they were authentic, it still does not detract from the authentic Hadith of Nabi Muhammad ρ.

Similarly, Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan claims that the wife of Imaam Zainul Aabideen (rahmatullah alayh) placed a tent/sail over her husband's grave. This is another treachery by the Mufti Saheb. Had he narrated the entire narration in its totality, the truth would have been revealed. This episode explains clearly that by way of dialogue an unseen caller had announced a distaste to this action. [Mishkaat, vol. 1 page 152]

And then their proving the building of domes etc. on graves by citing the incident of Hadhrat Uthmaan bin Madhoon τ, where a stone was placed on his grave merely as a means of identification, can only be the result of the intellect of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan and his ilk.

In summary, there is no authentic narration, neither *aqli* nor *naqli* proof of building up and constructing domes on the graves of the Auliya-e-Kiraam (rahmatullah alayhim). In fact there is a flood of proof to the contrary.

The ruling to demolish domes

It has been reported of Imaam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayh) that he instructed the demolishing of the domes on the graves of the Aimmah-e-Kiraam.

Hadhrat Abul Hayaaj Asadi (rahmatullah alayh), who was an army officer narrates, *"Ali τ said to me I do not depute you except with that which Muhammad ρ has deputed me and that is you don't leave any picture or statue without having destroyed it, and you don't leave any raised grave except that you level it."* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 1 page 312/ Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 1 page 148/ Tirmidhi Shareef, vol. 1 page 125]

The meaning of 'to level' graves does not mean flattening them completely. It implies making them all of the same height (hand-span), which is what the Shariah desires. Allaamah Alaahuddeen Al-Marooni Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 745 AH) writes, *"The meaning of levelling the graves implies making all the graves of the sameheight in accordance to what the Shariah desires."* [Al-Jawharun Naqi Alal Baihaqi, vol.4 page 3]

Hadhrat Imaam Baihaqi (rahmatullah alayh) reports that the height of the grave of Nabi ρ was about a hand-span above the ground. [Sunanul Kubra vol.3 page 410]

Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"Indeed the Sunnah is that the grave not be raised above the surface of*

the earth excessively-in fact it should be raised about a hand-span." [Sharah Muslim vol. 1 page 312]

From this authentic and clear narration we understand that Nabi ρ instructed the razing of high graves and that he deputed Hadhrat Ali τ with this task. During the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Ali τ he deputed this task to an army officer serving under him. This prohibition is categorized as being an integral part of the Shariah and not as averred by Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan as being a matter of Zuhd and Taqwa. [Jaa-al Haq, page 278] Even if we assume this to be a matter of Zuhd and Taqwa, then how come you don't implement it?

Allaamah ibn Hajar Makki Shaafi' (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 974 AH] writes, *"It is Waajib to raze the high graves and demolish any dome or structure thereupon."* [Kitaabuz Zawaajir, page 163]

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) has gone as far as saying, *"Its demolishing is Waajib even if it be a Masjid."* [Mirqaat, vol.2 page 372] That is, even if some smart-aleck decides to build a Masjid around a grave, and places a dome upon it, then too its demolishing is Waajib, because even *Masjid-e-Dhiraar* was constructed in the name of a Masjid, and every reciter of the Qur'aan knows its fate.

Allaamah Sayed Mahmood Aaloosi Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1270 AH] writes, *"There is consensus that amongst the worst of Haraam acts and a means of shirk is to perform Salaat at a graveside, or constructing a Masjid upon/ around it (graves). It is Waajib to demolish such high graves upon which domes are constructed, because these are even more harmful than was Masjid-e-Dhiraar which was build in opposition to Nabi ρ. Nabi ρ*

instructed the levelling of high graves. It is Waajib to remove any lantern or lamp placed upon it and it is not permissible to make it waqf or nadhar." [Roohul Ma'aani, vol.15 page 219]

Haafidh ibn Qayyim Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 751 AH] writes, *"It is not permissible to leave them be and it is Waajib to demolish them."* [Zaadul Ma'ad, vol. 3 page 28] Similar is narrated from Shaikhul Hanaabilah, Haafidh ibn Taymiya (rahmatullah alayh), in *Kitaabul Istighaatha*, page 278. You have noted that the Hanafis, Shaafis and Hambalis have all given the instruction to level high graves and demolish domes and structures which have been constructed on graves. This they have all deemed Waajib.

Note: Most Ahl-e-Bid'ah degrade and revile Haafidh ibn Taymiya and Haafidh ibn Qayyim (rahmatullah alayhim), and they assail their lofty status. However, Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) praises them, saying, *"The two of them, (Haafidh ibn Taymiya and Haafidh ibn Qayyim - rahmatullah alayhim) are amongst the Akaabir of the Ahl-e-Sunnah Wal Jamaah and Auliya of this Ummah."* [Jam'ul Wasaa-il, vol.1 page 28]

Honourable readers, you have noted that Nabi ρ has, in an authentic narration instructed Hadhrat Ali τ to level high graves and that the Ulama-e-Kiraam, especially Mullah Ali Qaari Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh), Sayyid Mahmood Aaloosi Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) etc have ruled it Waajib to demolish domes and structures on graves. However, Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb has rendered a great disservice to the Deen by stating, *"If there graves have been built up, then it is Haraam to demolish it."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 229] By saying this he implies that Hadhrat Ali τ had perpetrated a Haraam act and that Nabi ρ had instructed an act which is Haraam—*Nauthubillah!*—and

the Fuqaha-e-Kiraam have also ruled something which is Haraam—*Nauthubillah!*

Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1323 AH] had so aptly and succinctly stated in reply to a question asked regarding the building of structures and domes on graves, *"Answer: From every angle, the Ahaadith have prohibited such acts hence they can never be rendered permissible by anyone. Consideration will only be given to Qur'aan, Hadith and statements of Mujtahiddeen, and not to the opponents of the Shariah. If the Arabs in Haramain initiate and practice upon any act which is not prescribed in the Shariah and is contrary to the Sunnah, it will never be acceptable. If there is none to prohibit them from these customs then this will never be a proof in the Shariah. Silence should not be maintained. They should be opposed and prevented in the light of the Kitaab and Sunnah."* [Fatawa-e-Rashidiya vol. 1 page 100]

The objection of the opposition

The crux of what Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan has written regarding this Hadith is that the instruction to level and demolish graves was issued with regard to the graves of the Mushrikeen. In substantiation of this view he forwards the Hadith wherein Nabi ρ had instructed the demolition of the graves of Mushrikeen. He states that Sheikh Ibn Hajar Makki (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Fat-hul Baari*, vol. 2, page 260, (this is the translation Mufti Ahmad Yaar offers), *"The graves of the Mushrikeen of the times of ignorance were demolished. He says, that is, besides those of the Ambiyaa υ and their followers, because levelling*

their graves would be a dishonour." [Jaa-al Haqq, page 280] The second reasoning he offers is that why is the mentioning of pictures coupled with graves? No Muslim has photos on their graves. From this it is obvious (he says) that here is meant the graves of the Mushrikeen, because they place the photos of their deceased on the grave. Thirdly, the instruction is to level the high graves, and the Sunnat for the graves of Muslims is that it be a hand-span high. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 280]

Reply

All these things are the result of Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan's ignorance and non-acquaintance to true knowledge. **Firstly,** because he mentions the name of the author of *Fat-hul Baari* to be Ibn Hajr Makki, whereas the author is Ibn Hajr Asqalaani (rahmatullah alayh), who is a predecessor and much more knowledgeable than Ibn Hajr Makki (rahmatullah alayh). But alas in this 14th century such people have gained title of Mufti who don't even have proper knowledge of Kitaab authors. We are surprised at such Muftis.

Secondly, Mufti Saheb is not even aware that exhumation of graves is one thing, which is what Nabi ρ ordered regarding the graves of the Mushrikeen and according to Mufti Saheb's statement Sheikh Ibn Hajr Makki (rahmatullah alayh) has commented on in Fat-hul Baari, and levelling of the graves is another thing. There is a world of difference between the two.

Thirdly, the research of the Mufti Saheb is also surprising when he says that photos are mentioned with the graves and that where will one find photos on the graves of Muslims? Subhaanallah! It is as though the Mufti Saheb has understood it that the photo and graves are together

whereas the order to level the graves is a separate one to the order of destroying pictures. They should be destroyed wherever they are. In Nisai Shareef, vol 1 page 221 this narration appears thus, *"And (do not leave) any picture in the house."* Mufti Saheb tell us, are there photos and pictures in the homes of Muslims nowadays or not?

Fourthly, Mufti Saheb has himself mentioned that high graves be levelled to the ground , whereas we have quoted from Allamah Maarooni (rahmatullah alayh) that the objective is not to level it to the ground, but rather to make them the same Shar'i prescribed height.

Fifthly, the research of the Mufti Saheb is also surprising that the grave be one hand-span above the ground. We don't know whether this is a translation of a Hadith that the graves be one hand-span high. This has been cited in Sunnanul Kubra and from Alamgiri that the grave should be one hand-span high [Ghunyatut Taalibeen, page 640/Ruknuddeen, page 208/Fataawa-e-Radwiyya, vol. 4 page 14/Malfoozaat, part 3, page 328]

Sixthly, take note that we are quoting one authentic narration which refutes Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan and his ilk, who claim that the Hadith of Hadhrat Ali τ relates to the graves of the Mushrikeen. In this regard the famous and renowned Taabiee Hadhrat Thumaama bin Shafee (rahmatullah alayh) narrates, *"We were with Hadhrat Fudhaala bin Ubaid τ in Rome, at the place Roodis, where one of our companions passed away. Hadhrat Fudhaala τ instructed that his grave be levelled in line with the others. And then he said, 'I have heard Nabi ρ order the levelling of graves.'"*[Muslim Shareef, vol.1 page 312/Nisai, vol.1 page 221/Abu Dawood, vol.2 page 105]

This narration has been reported by Imaam Baihaqi (rahmatullah alayh) in more detail, *"It has been reported from Thumaama bin Shafee that during the era of Ameer Muaawiyah τ we set out on an expedition. Fudhaala bin Ubaid τ was our leader. My cousin by the name of Nafi' bin Abd passed away. After we had buried him Hadhrat Fudhaala τ said, 'Place little sand lightly on the grave because Nabi ρ instructed us to level the graves.'"* [Sunnanul Kubra, vol.3 page 411]

This authentic narration proves that the instruction of levelling the graves was not a reference to the graves of the Mushrikeen, otherwise the high-ranking Sahaabah τ of Nabi ρ would most certainly not have implemented it for Muslims.

In summary the Sahaabah τ accepted without any qualms that this instruction pertained to the graves of Muslims. As for making Qiyaas of the grave of Nabi ρ to substantiate the building up of graves and placing domes thereupon, is incorrect because when Nabi ρ passed away, *"Some people suggested burying him next to the mimbar whilst others suggested Jannatul Baqi. In the midst Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ said that he heard Nabi ρ say that a Nabi is buried at the place where he passes away. Hence his grave was dug right there."* [Muwatta Imaam Maalik, page 80/Shimaail-e-Tirmidhi, page 28]

Since Nabi ρ demise was in the room of Hadhrat Aishah τ hence in accordance to this narration he was buried there. Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Umar τ were granted the honour of being buried next to him. If he was buried out of this place then the Sahaabah τ would most certainly have not built around it. Just as the graves of Hadhrat Uthmaan, Hadhrat Ali and countless other Sahaabah τ neither have domes nor

are built upon. After many centuries the Turks have constructed domes on some of the graves, however, this action of theirs is not a Shar`i proof, since Nabi ρ has expressly forbidden this. Any action which Nabi ρ has forbidden can never be made permissible by the action of anyone. In summary, it was not that the grave of Nabi ρ came first and the building around it thereafter. As mentioned previously, Nabi ρ was buried in the room of Hadhrat Aishah τ. According to the research of Shah Abdul Haqq Dehlwi (rahmatullah alayh), etc. mentioned that around the year 557 A. H. Sultaan Nuruddeen Shaheed Mahmood bin Zangi (rahmatullah alayh) constructed a very deep wall around the blesses grave of Nabi ρ which he secured and solidified. [see Jazbul Quloob Ila Diyaaril Mahboob, page 86] and then in the year 678 after Hijri Sultaan Qalaawoon Saalihi (rahmatullah alayh) constructed a green dome which stands to this day. Mufti Ahmed Yaar Saheb accedes to these facts [see Jaa-al Haqq, page 272]

Note: It has been established from authentic Ahaadith and from the Fuqaha-e-Kiraam (rahmatullah alayhim) that domes and structures on graves be demolished. However, this much should be kept in mind that this is the duty of the Sultan and Islamic government. This does not apply to every individual and layman. Therefore the masses should not take the law into their own hands.

To light lanterns on the graves

There is absolutely no substantiation in the Shariah for lighting lanterns, lights, scented sticks etc. at the graveside. In fact, the Shariah opposes this abominable practice. Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Abbaas τ reports that Nabi ρ said, *"Rasulullaah ρ has cursed those women who visit the graves and make it a place of Sajdah and place lanterns thereupon."* [Abu Dawood, vol. 2, page 105 / Muwaaruz

Zamaan, page 200 / Nisai, vol. 1, page 222, Tayaalisi, page 357 / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 71]

A similar narration has been reported by Hadhrat Abu Huraira τ. [See Muwaariduz Zam'aan, page 200 / Sunanul Kubra, vol. 4, page 78]

It is clear and obvious that any act which Nabi ρ had cursed can never under any circumstances be made permissible or Mustahab. There can also not be any good or benefit in such an act. Neither can a label of necessity or non-necessity be placed thereupon. When the Ahle Bid`ah extract all sorts of interpretations and proofs for the permissibility of such acts, then the burden is on their shoulders. As for their sources, we need to realise that none of them are sinless or Mujtahids. It is also unfathomable how they classify an act which Nabi ρ had cited as being cursed, to be Mustahab and worthy of reward? It is also a point worthy of note that Nabi ρ did not differentiate between the graves of a pious person or ignoramus. It is apparent that to light a lantern on the grave of any person is cursed by Nabi ρ. And then, they aver that the Hadith uses the word *'alaa'* (علي) which denotes above, hence to place the lantern on the sides of the grave is permissible. This claim of theirs is wholly ignorant. The word *'alaa'* denotes both meanings. Will Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan and his ilk translate the Aayat,

او كالذي مرّ علي قرية,

as meaning that Hadhrat Uzair υ passed by the villages walking on *top* of the peoples homes?

It is stated in the Hadith of Mi`raaj, where Nabi ρ said, *"And I passed by Moosa*—**فمررت علي موسي**"

In essence, the word *'alaa'* means 'by' 'next to', etc. As Allaah Ta`ala states:

ولا تقم علي قبره

"And do not stand by their (munaafiqeens) graves"

Does this mean that Nabi ρ should not stand above the graves of the Munaafiqeen, but he can stand beside them and make dua for them?

In essence, it is impermissible and accursed to place and light lanterns etc. above and besides graves.

The great Sahaabi, Hadhrat Amar bin 'Aas τ said, *"When I pass away, do not bring for me (professional) mourners or fire."* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 1, page 76]

Hadhrat Asmaa binti Abi Bakr τ made the following bequest, *"Do not light any fire by me."* [Muwatta Imaam Maalik, page 78]

Imaam Nawai (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"To light a fire by the deceased is Makrooh, according to the Hadith. It has been said that the reason for the Karaahat is that it is a sign of the days of ignorance. Ibn Habeeb Maaliki (rahmatullah alayh) said that the Karaahat is due to the ill-omen attached to fire."* [Sharah Muslim, vol.1, page 76]

Just take note that the Sahaabah τ had made special bequests that no fire be brought near them after their demise, but alas, nowadays the ignorant Ahle Bid`ah place the fire right at the gravesides of their saints, etc. They proffer all sorts of ridiculous excuses for doing this, like it is done out of respect for the inmate of the grave, for ease of the passer-bys, ease for those reciting Qur`aan Majeed, etc., etc. If the respect and honour of the Auliyaa is

accomplished by acting contrary to the words of Nabi ρ and if love for them can be found in that which Nabi ρ had cursed, then we say to the likes of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan & Co. that they can keep their lot! For us, the only respect which can be shown to the Auliyaa-e-Kiraam is to follow what has been instructed by Allaah Ta`ala and His Rasul ρ.

Haafidh Ibn Qayyim (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"Nabi ρ has prohibited from making Sajdah at the gravesides and lighting lanterns beside it."* [Zaadul Ma'aad, vol. 1, page 146]

It is stated in Fataawa Aalamgiri, *"The lighting of fires by the grave is amongst the customs of the ignorance."* [Fataawa Aalamgiri, vol. 1, page 178]

Nabi ρ had mentioned that amongst the most detested acts in the Sight of Allaah Ta`ala is following the customs of ignorance. [Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 27]

Hadhrat Shah Rafeeuddeen (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"That is to perpetrate Haraam acts, such as lighting lanterns at the gravesite, spreading a cloth over it and to use instruments of music there are all acts of detestable bid`ah. It is strictly forbidden to present oneself at such functions."* [Fataawa Shah Rafeeuddeen, page 14]

As you can see, right from the time of Nabi ρ, right until the present day, all the Ulama-e-Haqq have unanimously maintained that to light lanterns etc. by the gravesite is accursed, Haraam, Makrooh and an evil bid`ah.

Note: If due to a real need, like if the funeral takes place at night, then to light a lamp, light, etc. for the purpose of

burying the deceased, is even proven from Nabi ρ. This is no point of contention.

Placing cloths (chadar) and flowers on the graves

It is most certainly not proven from Nabi ρ or the Sahaabah τ that the graves of the pious are covered in cloths or decorated with flowers. There were graves of the Auliyaa (in the former eras), there were cloths and flowers, there were people who could place these on the graves, there also existed greater love and affection for the pious then, and yet, no one ever placed cloths and flowers on the graves. This act has not only gained acceptance nowadays, it has become a rewarding act! It has also gained the rank of being a sign of the Ahle Sunnat and a sign of Islaam! As for the proof of the Ahle Bid`ah which they take from the narration of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ where Nabi ρ was passing by two graves and he took a date-palm and broke it into two and placed on the graves, explaining that as long as the twigs remains green, the punishment in the grave will be eased for the inmates, who according to the narration were guilty of negligence at the time of urinating and carrying tales. [Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 1, page 42] This proof is totally incorrect and inapplicable.

Firstly, the ease in the punishment in the graves was owing to the intercession of Nabi ρ. The twigs were mere symbols of this. In this regard, Hadhrat Jaabir τ reports from Nabi ρ, *"Indeed I passed by two graves whose inmates were being punished. I wanted that this (punishment) be lifted from them owing to my intercession, as long as the twigs remained green."* [Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 418]

Even though the recitation of Qur`aan Majeed, *Tasbeehaat* and even greenery, are means of easing the difficulties in the grave, the lessening of punishment in the graves in this particular incident, was owing to the intercession of Nabi ρ, and the twigs were mere symbols and indications of this. The error of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan is manifest when he states, *"The lessening of the punishment in the graves was owing to the blessing of the Tasbeeh of the green twigs and not only the dua of Nabi ρ. If the easing of the punishment was due to the dua of Nabi ρ then why was the condition of it becoming dry stipulated? Hence, if we place flowers etc. by the grave, it will have some beneficial effects, Insha-Allaah."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 284]

Mufti Saheb, if the punishment was lessened because of the twigs, then why was the condition of green stipulated? The Qur`aan Majeed states that everything makes the Tasbeeh of Allaah Ta`ala, be it wet or dry. ***"And there is nothing, except that it hymns His praises, but you do not understand its Tasbeeh."***

Note: The incident reported in the narrations of both, Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas and Jaabir τ is the same. However there is a difference between the interpretations of two narrators. Such occurrences do occur in *Ilm-e-Hadith*. Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) and Allamah Khattabi (rahmatullah alayh) agree that the incident in both narrations is the same. Even if the incidents are not the same, as reported by Haafidh Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) [Fat-hul Baari, vol. 1, page 276], then too there is no problem. That narration which has the commentary of the intercession of Nabi ρ is also applicable to the narration which does not have this commentary. Hence the actual and real reason and cause for the lessening of the punishment in the graves was the intercession of Nabi ρ. *The Ahaadith—some explain others.*

Secondly, these twigs, used by Nabi ρ, were not from any normal or common tree. In fact, it is explicitly narrated in Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 418, that these twigs were **from such a tree which miraculously** presented itself before Nabi ρ and thereafter returned to its place.

Thirdly, even if we accept this narration as proof, then too, it only proves the use of wet twigs, not flowers, cloths, etc.

Fourthly, if we finally concede that this narration proves that wet twigs ease the punishment in the graves, and also that this same cause exists in flowers, then too this will only apply to the graves of sinners and faasiqs. How can it ever be implemented on the graves of the Auliya-e-Kiraam? Because Nabi ρ placed these twigs on the graves of two sinners and not on that of a Wali. [see Umdatul Qaari, vol.1, page 877]

Fifthly, it has never been proven from the lives of Nabi ρ , Sahaabah τ or anyone of the *Khairul Quroon*, where they placed green twigs or flowers on the graves of any saint.

There remains now the issue of Hadhrat Bareedah bin Khaseeb τ who made bequest to place a green twig on his grave. [Bukhaari Shareef, vol.1, page 181]

Some scholars mention that it is possible he made this bequest owing to his humility, considering himself to be a sinner. The question is, has anyone of the *Khairul Quroon* ever placed green twigs on the graves of those whom they considered Walis? Is this also proof for placing a cloth on a grave?

Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan avers that Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) wrote in *Islaahur*

Rusoom that flowers etc. be placed on the graves of sinners and faasiqs and not the pious. Their graves are free of any punishment which the flowers etc. would be a cause of reduction. It should however be considered those actions of the sinners for which it is a means of defence, it benefits the Saaliheen with higher stages. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 284]

Mufti Saheb gloats over this point, but he has not considered the general principle that Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ were also aware of this, so, why did they not place flowers on the graves of the pious? How come they deprived the Saaliheen from this rank-elevation?

Similarly, this Qiyaas of Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan is also baatil and rejected that there is life in one fresh flower, therefore it hymns Tasbih and Tahleel, which either earns rewards for the deceased or reduces his punishment, and it also affords the visitors to the grave a sweet scent. Hence, it is permissible to place it on the grave of every Muslim. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 283]

It is an accepted fact known to all that everything hymns the praises of Allaah Ta'ala. The Qur’aan-e-Majeed bears testimony to this fact, so why differentiate between wet and dry? Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ were well aware of this fact also, but they did not put it into practice. To top it all, what wetness, greenery or life is there in a cloth, which makes it permissible to place it on a grave? The view of one who is not sinless neither a Mujtahid is not proof in the Shariah. As for the statement of Imaam Shaami (rahmatullah alayh) and others that it is permissible to place a cover on the graves because it is a means of honouring the inmate of the grave, etc., etc. is not worthy of any consideration, because besides this being the view of a non-Mujtahid it is also without proof. Honouring graves is no new fad, that we need to rely on or accept the

Qiyaas of the *Muta-akhireen*. During the era of Rasulullaah ρ, the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe-Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim), there were also graves, but this was never their custom. Therefore we are not in need of any imagined and pseudo honour or respect. As they had done, we will do.

As for the Qiyaas of Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan, that *the origin of a chader lies in the fact that Nabi ρ did not prevent from the Ghilaaf (Kaaba cover) being used. For centuries a valuable green silk cloth was placed on the blessed grave of Nabi ρ. Until this day no one had prohibited it. There is also a Ghilaaf on the Maqaam-e-Ebrahim.* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 285]

This is *Qiyaas ma`al-Faariq* (illogical and baseless reasoning). The Ghilaaf used to be placed on the Kaaba during the time of Nabi ρ and he did not change this tradition, therefore this is an actual Sunnat. [see Bukhaari Shareef, vol.2 page 613]

Similarly even if the use of a Ghilaaf on Maqaam-e-Ebrahim is established, then it appears that it was only done during the *Khairul Quroon* and to equate this and make Qiyaas of it on placing a cloth on graves is illogical. All praise due to Allaah Ta`ala that this humble writer has performed Hajj twice, but never noticed a Ghilaaf being used on the Maqaam-e-Ebrahim.

As for the covering on the blessed grave of Nabi ρ it should be remembered that his ghusl, burial and grave etc. is a unique thing, which cannot be applied as a general practice for the masses.

The 'wonderful' proof of the Mufti Saheb

Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan writes that *the Auliya of Allaah Ta`ala and their graves are amongst the Shi`aar (signs) of Allaah Ta'ala, therefore respecting the Shi'aar of Allaah Ta`ala, i.e. the signs of Deen is a Qur'aanic injunction—* ***'And he who honours the Signs of Allaah Ta`ala indeed that it is from the piety of hearts'****. There are no conditions placed on the rendering of this honour. Whatever form of honour is customary and practiced amongst people is permissible. To place flowers on their graves, cloths, lanterns, etc. are all tokens of honour, hence permissible.* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 283]

Mufti Saheb has, in his research also categorized the graves of the Auliya as being among the Signs of Allaah Ta`ala! Hadhrat Shah Waliullah Saheb (rahmatullah alayh) has enumerated the *Shi`aar* of Allaah Ta`ala as being four—*Qur`aan Majeed, Kaabah, Nabi ρ and Salaat* [Hujjatullah, vol. 1, page 70]—No mention is made of graves, however Mufti Saheb's research has led him to include the graves as being amongst the Signs of Allaah Ta`ala. The Ulama of Aqaaid have expressly stated that besides those whom Allaah Ta`ala and Rasulullaah ρ have singled out with a good ending (i.e. vouched for their salvation), we cannot say with certainty regarding anyone else. We only have a good opinion regarding them. How then can we claim the *wilaayat* of anyone with certainty? And then, further, how can we ever make their graves the *Shi`aar* of Allaah Ta`ala? Now according to the mufti Saheb, the honour can be endowed upon these '*shi`aar*' by placing flowers, cloths and lanterns upon them! It has been mentioned before that neither did Nabi ρ nor the Sahaabah τ ever place twigs/flowers on the graves of any wali. The case of Hadhrat Bareeda τ was unique. In fact, greenery is only placed on the graves of sinners. This is a rather strange *shi`aar* of Allaah Ta'ala and wali, where we first

envisage him to be sinner and then place flowers etc. on his grave. *May Allaah Ta`ala save us!*

How can honour and respect ever be shown to a *shi`aar* of Allaah Ta`ala via the means of something which Nabi ρ has cursed (i.e. lanterns at the graves)? What strange reasoning spews forth from the likes of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan! Or does he aver that all this is proven from the Qur`aanic Aayat? *May Allaah Ta`ala save us many times over!*

This type of honour is never gleaned from the Qur`aanic Aayat nor from the practice of the Sahaabah τ. If it were the case, then Nabi ρ would not have cursed this act, neither would Sahaabah τ like Hadhrat Amar bin `Aas τ ever have made the bequest that they did. What strange beings these Ahle Bid`ah---they regard impermissible and Haraam acts as being rewarding and beneficial.

A new discovery!

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"During the era of Nabi ρ, even live people were prohibited from building solid structures. A Sahaabi built a solid structure and Nabi ρ became displeased, such that he did not reply to this Sahaabi's salaam. Only when he demolished the structure, did Nabi ρ reply to his salaam."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 275]
The onus is on Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan to prove from which Hadith it is established that there was prohibition during the era of Nabi ρ to build solid structures. When he cites the Hadith, then he should also consider his source and its authenticity. As for the narration quoted by him as proof, he should do the Ummat a favour and quote the narration in its entirety, so that the proper message and import be understood. Nabi ρ did not refuse to make

salaam to the particular Sahaabi because he had built a solid structure home, **rather because he had constructed a dome on the home,** and this was extremely distasteful to The Nabi of Allaah Ta`ala ρ. Hadhrat Anas τ reports, *"Nabi ρ came out one day, and we accompanied him. His eyes fell upon a protruding dome and asked, 'What is this?'..."* [Abu Dawood, vol. 2, page 355 / Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 2, page 441]

This narration states explicitly that only when this Sahaabi demolished the dome did Nabi ρ become pleased. Hark at this! Nabi ρ detested that domes be placed on the homes of even live people, how then would he have approved of it on graves? Especially when he disapproved of solid structures in general on graves. Nowadays, let alone people consenting to solid structures on graves, they even exhort the placing of domes thereupon, which is something Nabi ρ disliked and prohibited.

Another benefit of solidifying graves

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan states, *"I have seen two graveyards in my home-village. The one has solid graves and the other was free of it. Subsequently the graveyard was sold and a court case followed, which resulted in the court removing the graveyard which did not have solid graves from the Muslims. The graveyard which had solid graves was left in the ownership of the Muslims...I have now been informed that some graves are being built up solid in India, as a method of preserving their sanctity, like how Musaajid are made waqf."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 276]

How quaint! The question is this that in order to preserve a waqf, why did the Sahaabah τ not implement this practice. In fact, how come Nabi ρ was unaware of this particular

method of preserving waqf? Why did Nabi ρ prohibit from solidifying graves? Furthermore, how come Imaams Abu Hanifah, Muhammad (rahmatullah alayhim), etc., not implement this strategy? As for the graveyard which was lost from the Muslims, this was due to their neglecting the site and nothing else.

Appointing attendants at the graves

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"It is permissible to have 'mujaawir' (attendants for graves). A 'mujaawir' is that person who attends to graves, opens and closes the gates and keeps the keys with him, etc., etc. This is established from the Sahaabah τ. Hadhrat Aishah τ, the Mother of the Ummat was the caretaker and key-holder to the blessed grave of Nabi ρ. Whenever the Sahaabah τ desired to visit the blessed grave, she would open up for them. [See Mishkaat, baabud Dafan]"* [Jaa-al-Haqq, page 279]

We have referred to Mishkaat Shareef and also consulted the original source of this narration, and nowhere can we find proof to the erroneous and inaccurate claim of this Mufti Saheb. Take note of the actual narration: *"It has been reported from Qaasim bin Muhammad that he said, 'I came to Aishah τ* (his aunt)*, and said, 'O my mother! Open for me the grave of Nabi ρ and his two companions. She then opened up the three graves and showed me. They were neither raised too high nor flat with the ground...'"* [Abu Dawood, vol. 2, page 202 / Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 141]

Hadhrat Qaasim bin Muhammad (rahmatullah alayh), who was a Tabiee, was a real nephew of Hadhrat Aishah τ, and he was very young at the time. He showed a keen interest

to see the blessed graves of Nabi ρ, Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ -- his grandfather -- and Hadhrat Umar τ, and his aunt fulfilled his wish to do so. This narration makes absolutely no mention of any key or specific opening and closing. There is also no mention of Hadhrat Aishah τ opening up for the Sahaabah τ in general. The Sahaabah τ did not have any need to recognise or acquaint themselves with the graves of these great personalities, since they had buried them with their blessed hands. Yes, the Tabieen had the desire to see these blessed graves, as has or should every Muslim. This explains the reason why Hadhrat Qaasim bin Muhammad (rahmatullah alayh) desired to see the graves and his aunt fulfilled this wish of his. It was certainly not that she was the caretaker and attendant of the graves. *May Allaah Ta`ala save us from thinking such*!

The dua after Salaatul Janaaza

The best favour any friend, family or close associate of a person can show after his demise is to make dua for him/her. Individually, on any occasion and at any suitable time, dua can be made for the deceased. There is no harm or evil in this. There is sufficient proof in the *nusoos* to substantiate this. However, as for congregational dua for the deceased, this is only executed in the form of Salaatul Janaazah and *Talqeen* at the graveside. Besides this, wherever the Shariah has not shown congregational dua for the deceased is not permissible. Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) attended and buried thousands, nay countless people, and it has never been established from any of them that dua be made in congregational form after the completion of the Janaazah Salaat. The details have been mentioned previously regarding the Shar`i principle that general laws cannot be derived from specific issues/occurrences. This is however a general mistake committed. This is the reason

why the Fuqahaa of the Ahnaaf have prohibited and labelled Makrooh, the dua made after Janaazah Salaat. In this regard Imaam Abu Bakr bin Haamid Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 264 A.H] states, *"Indeed the dua after Salaatul Janaazah is Makrooh."* [Muheet-Baabul Janaaiz]

We have not cited the statement of Imaam Abu Bakr Haamid (rahmatullah alayh) from *Qunia*, which would give rise to Ahmad Yaar Khaan following in the footsteps of his senior, stating that *Qunia* is an unreliable source, and that those who follow *Qunia* are anti-Math-hab and *Mu`tazilahs,* etc., etc. [See Jaa-al Haqq, page 268]. Take note that we have quoted from *Muheet*, which is an authoritative Hanafi source. *Muheet* is available in the library of Madrasah Mazaahirul Uloom in India.

In any case, *Qunia* is not as unreliable as the 'great' Hadhrat of Barelvi avers. Only those citations of *Qunia* are not reliable which the other Fuqahaa have not supported. [See *Fawaahid Bahiya, page 213]*

Imaam Shamsul Aimmah Halwaani Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 454 A.H.] and the Mufti of Bukhaar, Qaadhi Sheikhul Islaam Allamah Sagdhi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 461 A.H] state, *"No man should stand for dua after the Salaat of Janaazah."* [Qunia, vol. 1, page 56]

Imaam Taahir bin Ahmad Bukhaari Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh), [passed away 542 A.H.] writes, *"No one should recite Qur`aan Majeed and make dua for the deceased after or before the Salaat of Janaazah."* [Khulaasatul Fataawa, vol. 1, page 225]

Allamah Sirajuddeen Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away around the 700 A.H] states, *"When the Salaat of Janaazah is complete, no one should make dua."* [Fataaa Siraajia, page 23]

Imaam Haafizuddeen Muhammad bin Shihaab Kardari Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 827 A.H] states, *"No one should stand for dua after Salaatul Janaazah, because he has already made dua once (i.e. in the Salaatul Janaazah)."*[Fataawa Bazaazia, vol. 1, page 283]

Imaam Shamsuddeen Muhammad Khuraasaani Kohastaani Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 926 A.H.] writes, *"None should stand up for dua for him (i.e. the deceased, after Janaazah Salaat)."* [Jaamiur Ramooz, vol. 1, page 125]

Allamah Ibn Nujaim Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"Dua should not be made after Salaat (of Janaazah)."* [Bahrur Raa`iq, vol. 2, page 183]

Mufti Muhammad Naseerudden Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"Dua should not be made after the Janaazah Salaat."* [Fataawa Barhana, page 36]

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Dua should not be made for the deceased after the Salaatul Janaazah, because it implies an addition to the Salaat."* [Mirqaat, vol. 2, page 219]

It is stated in the famous Fiqh Kitaab, *Majmoo'a Khaani*, *"That is, dua should not be made and the final ruling is on this."* [page 349]

Mufti Sa`adullaah Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1292 A.H] states, *"This is not free from*

abomination, because most of the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam have prohibited it because it is an addition to the Sunnat Practice." [Fataawa Sa`dia, page 130]

Moulana Abdul Hayy Lucknowi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It is Makrooh to make dua after the Salaat of Janaazah."* [Naf`ul Mufti wa Saa`il, page 61]

Besides these, numerous other Fuqahaa have prohibited from making dua after the Janaazah Salaat. See *Mudkhal* of Ibn Ameerul Haaj, vol. 3, page 22 / *Mazaahirul Haqq* of Nawaab Qutbuddeen Khaan Saheb, vol.2, page 57, etc.

As for the proof gleaned by the statement of Imaam Fadhli (rahmatullah alayh) who said, **لا بأس به** *"There is no harm in it"*– this has no substance, because, firstly, his statement stands no comparison to the countless other opposing views of the other Fuqahaa. Secondly, Allamah Shaami (rahmatullah alayh) explains this in Shaami, page 82, vol. 1, stating that this statement of **لا بأس به** implies *Karaahat Tanzeehi*, and that it also implies non-Mustahab [vol. 1, page 88].

A Molvi Muhammad Umar makes the following preposterous statement, *"He who prohibits from making dua is amongst the most stupid person of all time."* [Miqyaas, page 537]

Molvi Umar Saheb should tell us that are all those Fuqahaa from whom we had quoted who say that dua after the Janaazah Salaat is impermissible, stupid? He should reflect carefully and reply.

Respected Readers! Reflect and take note that the senior Ulama amongst the Ahnaaf have ruled dua after Janaazah

Salaat as Makrooh, because it is a form of adding on to a Sunnat practice. Had this practice been in vogue during the *Khairul Quroon*, then these personalities would most certainly have not ruled thus. But alas! The Ahle Bid`ah have today made this anti-Sunnah and Makrooh practice permissible and Mustahab.

Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It is a grave sin to consider a Makrooh act as being valid, because to consider a Haraam act as permissible leads one into kufr and to deem a Makrooh act as good, is one stage away from this. One should understand the gravity of this act properly."* [Maktoobaat, part 5, page 74]

It is appropriate that we peruse the objections levelled by the Ahle Bid`ah to the rulings cited earlier on regarding the dua after Janaazah Salaat.

Objections: Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"There are two replies to the objections (that the texts of the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam indicate dua after Janaazah Salaat to be Makrooh): firstly, the prohibition to this dua is due to three reasons—first is after the fourth Takbeer before the salaam, second is that the dua not be lengthened considerably such that it delays the burial, therefore it is not permissible to delay the burial in waiting for Jumuah Salaat. Third is that rows are not to be formed when making this (second) dua which will lead people to think that the Salaat is in progress, which will lead to it being a similarity to the Salaat itself. Therefore if after the Salaat, people sit down or break up the rows and make dua it will be permissible without any Karaahat. These possibilities have been extracted owing to the texts of the Fuqaha not being contradictory to each other and these statements not being in opposition to any Ahaadith or statement and practice of the Sahaabah τ. The second reply is that from*

the various texts there is no prohibition of dua in Jami`ur-Rumooz, Zakhirah, Muheet and Kashful-Ghitaa. In fact they (only) prohibit standing up and making dua, which we also prohibit. It is also stated in Mirqaat and Jaami`ur-Rumooz that it implies an addition (to the Shariah)..." [Jaa-al Haqq, page 268]

Reply: This explanation clearly illustrates and is the result of the ignorance and unawareness of Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan and for many reasons it is not worthy of any consideration. **Firstly** because even though there exists difference of opinion between the Ahnaaf and Shawaafi` regarding dua which is made after the fourth Takbir before the Salaam in Janaazah Salaat. The Ahnaaf prohibit it and Shawaafi` allow it. Nevertheless, all those references which we cited earlier of the Fuqaha-e-Kiraam most certainly do not refer to any dua after the fourth Takbir and before Salaam. **It is clearly stated that the dua *after* the Salaat itself is prohibited.** This can obviously be discerned from the texts themselves because they include the condition of *"after Salaatul-Janaazah"*. How can it be taken to mean dua before Salaam?

Secondly it cannot be deduced from any reliable Faqih that the prohibition denotes lengthy duas, and that short duas are permissible. This is only according to the lopsided thinking of the likes of Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan. The very statements of the Fuqaha-e-Kiraam denounces this view of the Mufti, where they state specifically—لا يدعوا *Do not make Dua.* This statement is a general one and no conditions are attached to it.

Thirdly, the paucity of understanding and lack of intelligence of the Mufti Saheb leads him to understand the statement of لا يقوم بالدعاء means that only standing in rows and making dua is prohibited because it has the similarity

to Salaat itself and that breaking up the saffs or sitting down and making dua is permissible. He has not considered carefully that the word يقوم does not appear alone, rather it is coupled with the words بالدعاء. This means that dua should not be established after the Janaazah Salaat. Mufti Saheb should take out some time and study the Arabic language more in detail.

Fourthly, if we have to assume that the meaning of لا يقوم بالدعاء is that dua should not be made standing, then what will be the meaning of the statement in Bahrur-Raa`iq which states, *"Do not make dua after Salaam."* Here the words لا يقوم do not appear. In this text there is no condition of sitting or standing, being in rows or out. It is a general prohibition.

In essence the claim of Mufti Ahmed Yaar Khaan that the prohibition only applies to dua made standing, is spurious and baatil.

Fifthly, the claim of the Mufti Saheb that, *"these possibilities have been extracted owing to the texts of the Fuqaha not being contradictory to each other and these statements not being in opposition to any Ahaadith or statement and practice of the Sahaabah τ"* is nonsensical and a mere whimsical fantasy concocted by him. Since the texts of the Fuqaha-e-Kiraam do not contradict each other, why then is it necessary to extract all these possibilities? **And since dua after Janaazah Salaat has not been established from any authentic Hadith or statement and practice of the Sahaabah τ, what is the object of opposing it?**

Sixthly, the Mufti Saheb says that they also prohibit from standing and making dua whereas on page 263 Hadhrat Ibn Oufa τ states, *"…stood and made dua and said, 'I have*

seen Nabi ρ doing such.'" Since Nabi ρ had stood and made dua, what right does the Mufti Saheb have to prohibit this practice? Although this narration may be weak due to one of the narrators, Ebrahim Hijri, being an unreliable and weak narrator, nevertheless whatever has been established that after the fourth Takbir before the Salaam he made dua, which is a practice of the Shawaafi`. Imaam Baihaqi (rahmatullah alayh) has listed a chapter to establish this. [Sunnanul Kubra, vol. 4, page 42]

This narration is also present in Musnad-e-Ahmed, vol.4, page 356.

The proofs of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan for dua after Janaazah Salaat and its reply

Mufti Saheb writes, *"It appears in Mishkaat, baabus Salaat, second chapter, 'When you perform Salaat on the deceased, then make special dua for him.' From this gauge that dua should be made for the deceased immediately after the Janaazah Salaat, without any delay…"* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 262]

Reply

The interpretation which the Mufti Saheb has made of the Hadith that after the Janaazah Salaat, special dua be made for the deceased is wholly incorrect and spurious. **Firstly,** because this meaning is in direct conflict with the actual import of the narration. Nabi ρ was actually telling us that when dua is made for the deceased in the Salaatul Janaazah, then this dua must be made with utmost sincerity. It most certainly does not mean that the Salaat be performed without any sincerity and then dua must by made with sincerity thereafter. Besides this, it is stated in *Mudawwanatul Kubra* in vol. 1, page 174, that Nabi ρ

said, *"In the Salaat for the deceased, be sincere in your dua"*. This is clear and explicit that Nabi ρ is referring to the dua *in* the Janaazah Salaat.

Secondly, Nabi ρ had practically demonstrated this, that the sincerity be in the Salaat itself. Nabi ρ would perform the Janaazah Salaat with such emotional words and in such a manner that those Sahaabah τ who were present (and alive), wished that they were the recipients of that dua. See the narration of Hadhrat Auf bin Maalik τ, in Muslim Shareef, vol. 1, page 311, Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 145, etc. There is a narration in Sunnanul Kubra, vol. 4, page 39, where Nabi ρ demonstrated the method of Janaazah Salaat to one Sahaabi. This narration clearly indicates that dua with sincerity be made and that this dua refers to the dua in the Salaat before the salaam.

Thirdly, if this was the meaning of the narration as the Mufti Saheb avers, then why did the Fuqahaa, specifically the Ahnaaf, prohibit dua after Janaazah Salaat? Is it imaginable that the Fuqaha would rule an express desire of Nabi ρ to be Makrooh?

Another proof of the opposition party

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb cites a narration from Kanzul Ummaal where it is stated that Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abu Aufa τ performed the Janaazah of his daughter and made dua after the fourth Takbeer. Thereafter he stated that he saw Nabi ρ doing like this. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 263]

Reply

Citing this narration as proof is totally incorrect. **Firstly,** because Ebrahim Hijri is one of the narrators, who the

Muhadditheen-e-Kiraam regarded as extremely weak and unreliable. Imaam Abu Zur`a states that he is weak, Imaam Abu Haatim says that he is *Daeeful Hadith* and *Munkarul Hadith* (i.e. his narrations are weak and rejected). Imaam Tirmidhi states that he is weak. Similar descriptions are given by Imaam Abu Ahmad Al-Haakim, Allamah Ibn `Adi, Allamah Ibn Sa`ad, Imaam Sa`di, Imaam Harbi (rahmatullah alayhim), etc.

Secondly, this dua was not made after the Salaatul Janaazah. It referred to the dua made after the fourth Takbeer before the salaam, which is the practice and view of the Shawaafi'. **The Ahnaaf do not make any dua after the fourth Takbeer before the Salaam.** In this regard, Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It appears in one narration thus, 'Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abi Aufa made four Takbeers and stalled for some time, until we thought that he will make a fifth Takbeer also., but then he made salaam to his right and left.'"* [Riyaadus Saaliheen, page 369 / Kitaabul Athkaar, page 145]

Hadhrat Imaam Baihaqi (rahmatullah alayh) sets up a chapter for this narration entitled thus, *"The Chapter regarding what was narrated regarding Istighfaar for the deceased and dua for him, between the fourth Takbeer and Salaam."* [Sunnanul Kubra, vol. 4, page 42]

To use this narration to prove dua after the completion of Salaatul Janaazah is ignorance and treachery.
Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan states that it is written in Baihaqi that Hadhrat Ali τ once made a dua after performing Janaazah Salaat for someone. [Jaa-al Haqq page 263] This is another classic example of the Mufti Saheb limited intelligence. It appears in the narration of Baihaqi that Hadhrat Ali τ performed Janaazah Salaat and some people were not present there. *"They said, 'O*

Ameerul Mu'mineen we were not present for his Salaat.' He then joined them in performing another Jamaat. Their Imaam was Qurza bin Ka'b τ." [Sunanul Kubra, vol. 4 page 45]

It appears in another narration, *"Qurza bin Ka'b and his companions came after the burial and they were instructed to perform Salaat for him (the deceased)."* [Ibid]

This narration proves, if anything, the validity of performing a second Janaazah Salaat or to perform it after the burial. There is no point of contention here. To prove here the validity of dua after the Janaazah Salaat, is baseless. Similarly, the claim of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan that Nabi ρ performed the Janaazah Salaat of Hadhrat Ja'far bin Abi Taalib and Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Rawaahah τ in the absence of the bier and then made dua [Jaa-al Haqq, page 262] is also baseless and incorrect. Besides Hadhrat As-hamah Najaashi τ, the narrations relating to Nabi ρ performing Janaazah Salaat in absence of the deceased for anyone else is not proven with absolute certitude. **When the Salaat proper cannot be properly proven, where can the dua after the Salaat (for these occasions) be proven?**

As for the narration of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Salaam τ who arrived late for a Janaazah Salaat and exclaimed (as translated by Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan), *"If you hade performed Salaat before me, then do not read the dua ahead of me (i.e. come with me and make dua)."* [Mabsoot, vol. 2, page 67]

Extracting proof from this narration is also baatil and spurious, because, there is no indication in the narration to *'come with me and make dua'*. This is a concoction of Mufti Saheb, himself, which most certainly is not worth

any consideration. When was this dua? Before or after the burial? In the graveyard, house or at the Masjid? This narration does not give any indication as to the time or place of this occurrence. The indication in this narration is that since he had missed the actual Janaazah Salaat, he will make an individual dua with sincerity which will compensate for his absence from the Salaat.

Note: The recitation of the opening and ending verses of Surah Baqarah at the head and feet side of the grave after the burial is correct and proven from authentic Ahaadith. Similar is the recitation of Tasbeeh, Tahleel, etc. proven from the Ahaadith. These acts are completely beyond the bounds of this discussion. Similarly even a general dua is not prohibited. If one wishes, he may make a dua at the graveside. However, the congregational dua which is made immediately after the Janaazah Salaat is prohibited, as has been proven earlier.

To recite Thikr and Qur`aan Majeed, etc. whilst accompanying the deceased

There is no scope or permission from the Ahaadith Shareef and Fiqh-e-Hanafi to recite Thikr in congregational form whilst accompanying the bier, and that too, loudly. Haafidh Ibn Katheer (rahmatullah alayh) reports from Tibraani, the narration of Hadhrat Zaid bin Arqam τ [passed away 66 A.H.], that Nabi ρ said, *"Indeed Allaah Ta`ala loves silence (especially) in three things, during tilaawat of the Qur`aan, on the battlefield and during a Janaazah."* [Tafseer Ibn Katheer, vol. 2, page 219]

Hadhrat Imaam Muhammad and Allamah Ibn Nujaim (rahmatullah alayhima) report from Hadhrat Qais bin Ubbaad (rahmatullah alayh), *"The Companions of Rasulullaah ρ detested loud voices during three*

(occasions), Janaazah, battle and thikr." [As-Siyarul Kabeer, vol. 1, page 89 / Bahrur Raa`iq, vol. 5, page 76 / Ibn Abi Shaiba, vol. 10, page 530 and vol. 12, page 462]

In fact, there is a narration of Hadhrat Hassan τ that Nabi ρ did not like loud voices during three occasions, during tilaawat of Qur`aan Majeed, Janaazah and on the battlefield. [As-Siyarul Kabeer, vol. 1, page 189]

These narrations clearly spell out that Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ regarded as Makrooh the raising of the voices for Thikr (or anything else) during a Janaazah. On such occasions, Allaah Ta`ala actually loves silence. This is the reason why the Fuqahaa-e-Ahnaaf have dilated and explained in detail this ruling, that to raise the voices in Thikr during the Janaazah and to make Tilaawat of Qur`aan Majeed loudly is Makrooh and bid`ah. This Karaahat is not merely *Tanzeehi*, it is of the category of Haraam. It is stated in Aalamgiri, *"Those people who accompany the bier, it is necessary that they remain silent. It is Makrooh for them to recite Thikr and Qur`aan Majeed loudly."* [Reported from Sharah Tahaawi in Aalamgiri, vol. 1, page 172]

Imaam Siraajuddeen (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *'Raising the voices in Thikr and with tilaawat of Qur`aan and to say 'All the living will die', etc. behind the bier is bid`ah."* [Siraajia, page 23]

There appears a similar ruling in Durrul Mukhtaar in Kitaabul Janaaiz.

Allamah Ibn Nujiam (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"It is appropriate for those who accompany the bier to undergo a protracted silence. It is Makrooh to make Thikr loudly, recite Qur`aan Majeed and anything else during he*

Janaazah. The karaahat here is Karaahat-e-Tahreemi." [Bahrur Raa`iq, vol. 2, page 199]

The Fuqahaa-e-Ahnaaf have clearly spelt out and clarified that to raise the voice in Thikr, tilaawat and any other statement whilst accompanying the Janaazah is Makrooh-e-Tahrimi.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"Those Fuqahaa who have stated that loud Thikr with the bier is Makrooh, have meant Makrooh-e-Tanzihi."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 391]

Yes, as for that person who makes Thikr softly, to himself, this is permissible. In this regard, Imaam Qaadhi Khaan (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It is Makrooh to raise the voice in Thikr (during the Janaazah). Whosoever desires to remember Allaah Ta'ala, should make Thikr to himself."* [Qaadhi Khaan, vol. 1, page 91]

You have noted that the Sahaabah τ and the Fuqahaa of Ahnaaf have explicitly stated that raising the voice in Thikr and Tilaawat during the Janaazah is Makrooh-e-Tahrimi and a bid`ah.

However Molvi Muhammad Umar, proves this by citing some Aayaat and then goes on to fire the following salvo, ***"To recite Kalimah Tayyibah with the Janaazah****: And then in Jamius Sagheer Suyooti, Kunuzul Haqaaiq Munaadi and Kanzul Ummal appears the narration where Nabi ρ said that the Kalimah 'Laa Ilaaha Illallahu' should be recited in abundance at the time of Janaazah --- It is reported in another narration that Nabi ρ said we should prepare the luggage of the deceased by the recitation of 'Laa Ilaaha Illallahu'. Hence from these narrations we see that there is benefit and reward for the deceased if the Kalimah is recited with the Janaazah. It is necessary for*

the Ahle Sunnah in this era to recite Thikr loudly for the deceased, so that the Muslims may come to know of the funeral of a Wahhabi and Hanafi." [Miqyaasul Hanafiyat, page 584]

Subhaanallaah! This is the proof of Molvi Muhammad Umar Saheb for reciting the Thikr whilst accompanying the bier. He avers that wherever the exhortation of Thikr appears in the Qur`aan Majeed, it includes reciting it with the Janaazah.

We have mentioned before, **with Shar`i substantiation that an individual matter cannot be proven based on a general law.** These very same Qur`aanic Aayaat which this Molvi cites were also present before the Sahaabah τ and Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam (rahmatullah alayhim), but they did not come to this conclusion. As for the narrations which he had cited, they are insufficient to prove this issue compared to the many narrations and rulings we has just cited earlier. The correct interpretation of the narrations that he has cited is that at the time of death *talqeen* of the Kalimah should be made. This has been established from the Ahaadith Shareef. The *talqeen* of the Shahaadatain is a well accepted practice amongst the Muslims. It is also a possibility that during the Janaazah Salaat, the Kalimah should be recited in abundance as a dua, since this is the best form of Thikr. The words **في الجنازه** which appears in the narrations confirm this.

Athaan at the graveside

It is established from the Ahaadith of Nabi ρ that after the completion of the Janaazah Salaat, the deceased is buried in the grave and *Bismillah ala Sunnati Rasulillah*, etc. is recited. After the grave is covered, the opening and closing

verses of Surah Baqarah is read at the head and feet side, respectively. Similarly, in some Surahs, mention is made of Surah Faatiha as well. It is also established from a narration that Nabi ρ recited *Subhanallah* and *Alhamdulillah* at the grave of Hadhrat Sa`ad bin Ma`aaz τ and the Sahaabah τ made *talqeen* of this. Istighfaar is also established. All these methods are correct and established from Ahaadith. It has also been established that Nabi ρ **stood at the graveside and made dua and exhorted this practice.** However, the calling out of Athaan at the graveside has not been established neither from Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen or Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). During those days there were graves wherein people were buried, Athaan was existent, people to call out Athaan were also present, then how come this practice of calling Athaan out at the graves was not permissible then, whereas many centuries later this practice has become permissible?

Athaan is a specific act of Ibaadat, which the Shariah has specified certain rules for its execution. To exceed these bounds will be tantamount to sin.

Imaam Gharnaati (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"And regarding this, Ibn Barr has reported a unanimity from all the Ulama that Athaan and Iqaamat are not given on the two Salaats of Eid."* [Al-I'tisaam, vol. 2, page 14]

This is the reason why the Fuqahaa of the Ahnaaf have vehemently criticised any act which is contrary to the Sunnah to be carried out at the gravesite. In this regard, Imaam Ibn Humaam Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh), has noted in his incomparable work, *"Every such act is Makrooh at the graveside which is not proven from the Sunnat. The only acts which are established form the Sunnat are visiting the graves and standing at its side and*

making dua (for the deceased), as did Nabi ρ practice when he went out to (Jannatul) Baqi. He would recite the following dua:

السلام عليكم دارقوم مؤمنين و انّا انشاءالله بكم لاحقون اسأل الله لي و لكم العافية"

[Fat-hul Qadeer,vol.2, page 22]

Similar is reported in Bahrur Raa`iq, vol. 2, page 192, Durrul Mukhtaar, vol. 1, page 166, Fataawa Aalamgiri, vol. 1, page 107, etc. From this also we realise that all such acts at the graveside, besides what has been established from the Sunnah is Makrooh.

Allamah Ibn Aabideen Shaami (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"…to give Athaan at the graveside as many people are habituated to nowadays is not Sunnat. Imaam Ibn Hajar has explicitly stated in his Fataawa that it is a bid`ah to give Athaan at the graveside."* [Shaami, vol. 1, page 659]

It is stated in *Durrarul Bihaar*, *"Amongst the acts of bid`ah which have been spread through India is the Athaan at the graveside after the burial."*

All these excerpts sufficiently prove that the Athaan at the graveside after the burial has no place in our Pure Shariah. It is contrary to the Sunnah and also a bid`ah. All these citations are sufficient for any level-headed and unbiased person. As for the stubborn person, no amount of proof will suffice.
Take a look now at the presentations and objections levelled by the opposite party and our replies to them, and you will be able to distinguish for yourself between Haqq and Baatil.

First objection: Molvi Ahmad Razaa Khaan writes, *"(Regarding those texts where dua is mentioned) Athaan is also a dua, in fact, it is one of the best duas. It is Thikr-e-Ilaahi, and every Thikr-e-Ilaahi is a dua, hence this is also amongst the proven Sunnat practices."* [Eezaanul Ajar, page 8]

Reply: This statement of Khaan Saheb is a great blunder and is baatil due to many reasons. **Firstly,** because although Thikr and dua are technically the same, in general terminology (according to *urf*) they are not. Dua implies asking and requesting, whereas Thikr is free from this. In this regard, Allamah Shaatbi states, *"Thikr, according to the urf is separate from dua."* Al-I'tisaam, page 288]

The narration which has been cited from Fat-hul Qadeer, where Nabi ρ made dua for the inmates of *Jannatul Baqee*, he asked for *'aafiyat* (safety, peace and glad tidings) for them. This is established from the Sunnah.

Secondly, Khaan Saheb himself mentions in *Fataawa Radhwiya*, vol. 2, page 502 that Athaan is not a pure Thikr, so how come now all of a sudden he classifies it as a Thikr, and that too as Thikr-e-Ilaahi?

Thirdly, even if we accept that Athaan is a dua, then how come, Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen etc. did not realise it to be a dua, and they never called it out at the graveside? When these personalities and the Fuqahaa have not adopted this practice, how is it that the view of someone else be accepted as proof?

Second Objection: Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb says that what the author of *Bahrur Raa`iq* states regarding everything else done at the graveside besides *ziyaarat* and dua, is correct. This is relating to visiting the graves, that is, when one goes to the grave with the intention of

visiting, then one should not do any impermissible act like kissing the grave, prostrating, etc. But, here we are speaking about the time of burial, and not visiting. If burial was also included in his statement, then to lower the deceased into the grave, giving planks (for covering), throwing sand over the grave, etc., etc., which Fataawa Rashidiya has even said is permissible, would all be prohibited! [Jaa-al Haqq, page 303/4]

Reply: This then is the reply of *Mufti* Ahmad Yaar Khaan! The author of *Bahrur Raa`iq* has explicitly used the words **عند القبر** (by the grave) and not **في القبر** (in the grave). Lowering the deceased into the grave is related to (matters) *in the grave.* Similarly, the placing of planks and throwing sand also refers to *in the grave* and not *by the grave*. Yes, the *talqeen* which takes place after the burial does take place *by the grave¸* and this is established from the Ahaadith. As for visiting the grave and dua at the graveside, this is not done before the burial --- no one does this at an empty grave! One should also remember that *talqeen* refers to the recitation of the opening and closing verses of Surah Baqarah, which is established from the narration of Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ. [Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 1, page 149]

Third objection: (Regarding the reference made by Allamah Shaami (rahmatullah alayh) to Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) who said that it is a bid`ah to give Athaan at the graveside. **Firstly,** Ibn Hajar is a Shaafi'. Many Ulama, amongst which are Hanafis state that to give Athaan at the grave is Sunnat. Since Ibn Hajar differs with view, should the Hanafis follow the majority or the Shawaafi'? Secondly, Ibn Hajar has not prohibited the Athaan being given at the graveside, he has merely refuted it being a Sunnat. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 302]

Reply: What the Mufti Saheb has written is not worth the paper it is written on. **Firstly,** because, this is the very same Ibn Hajar and Imaam Suyooti (rahmatullah alayhima) who are Shaafi' but the Ahle Bid`ah party use them to substantiate the prove the celebration of Meelaad. At that time, it appears their being Shaafi matters not? On that occasion, the praises that are lauded on Ibn Hajar by these people renders their tongues dry, but now all of a sudden-- *should the Hanafis follow the majority or the Shawaafi'?*

Secondly, Ibn Hajar has not merely refuted the practice as not being a Sunnat, he has explicitly stated that it is a bid`ah. In this regard, Mufti Saheb himself cites the statement of Shaami as follows, *"Ibn Hajar has explicitly stated that this is a bid`ah and whoever regards it as a Sunnah is not correct."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 303]

Allamah Shaami's (rahmatullah alayh) text prior to this is as follows, *"It is not a Sunnat to give Athaan at the time of lowering the deceased into the grave, as is being practiced nowadays."* [Shaami, vol. 1, page 837]

When Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) has labelled this act a bid`ah, how can it ever be averred that he has not prohibited from it?

Thirdly, the author of *Durrarul Bihaar* is a Hanafi, not Shaafi', why was his ruling not refuted? Similarly, Allamah Shaami (rahmatullah alayh), who is a Hanafi, has cited the text of Ibn Hajar as substantiation of his claim and view. How come this is overlooked?

Fourthly, who exactly are those Ulama, amongst them some Hanafi, who consent to and say that Athaan by the grave is Sunnat? Please do list their names and Kitaab references. Why do you leave their names and references a

secret? Let us also into the secret as to who exactly those Ulama are who regard Athaan at the graveside as Sunnat.

Our Ulama have spelt this ruling out clearly and in no uncertain terms, *“Reply: To call out Athaan at the graveside is contrary to the Sunnat and an evil bid`ah, as is established from the texts of the Fuqahaa.”* [Fataawa Daarul Uloom Deoband, vol. 5, page 382]

Kissing the finger during Athaan

There is not single aspect in the life of Nabi ρ that is hidden from the Ummat and of which we have no guidance. Every little act and speech of Nabi ρ has been recorded and is available for scrutiny and guidance. With regard to a great Ibaadat like Athaan, which is given five times a day, which was called out in Nabi’s ρ presence for at least ten years after Hijrat in Madinah Shareef, and regarding which the words and names of callers have all been meticulously mentioned in the Ahaadith. **However, there is not a single authentic narration which advocates kissing the finger during the Athaan.** If the name of Muhammad is so beloved to one, (which it should be to every Muslim), then it would be more logical to kiss the face of the caller of the Athaan from whose lips the name emits, rather than to kiss one’s own fingers which are attached to one’s body, and from which neither the name of Muhammad ρ is written nor emits. When this act has not been proven from the *Khairul Quroon* in whose eras the Athaan was given daily, then who in this age can claim it to be part of the Deen? How can it be called a *Shi`aar* of the Deen and why are those who do not do it, criticized?
As for the narrations which are cited in proof of this act, is the one of Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ where when he heard the words of انّ محمدا رسول الله, *“He kissed the inside of his Kalimah fingers and placed it on his eyes. Then Nabi*

(sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said, 'He who does as my beloved had done, my intercession will be Waajib for him.'" This narration has been cited from *Masnad Firdous Daylami*, page 36 and *Maudoo-aat Kabeer*, page 75. Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan also mentions the reference of *Maqaasid-e-Hasana* in Jaa-al Haqq, page 378.

Reply: Allamah Muhammad Taahir Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) writes regarding this narration, *"It is not authentic."* [Tazkeeratul Maudoo-aat, page 36]

Mullah Ali Qaari and Allamah Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) also say the same. [Maudoo-aat-e-Kabeer, page 75]

When a narration is not authentic, how can it be practiced upon? Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb quotes this from Imaam Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) and states, *"This Hadith has not reached the level of authenticity."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 378]

Molvi Muhammad Umar Saheb demonstrates his treachery by quoting this narration from both sources (mentioned above) but conveniently omits the part of **لایصحّ**.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb, states, *"If a narration is not authentic, then it does mean that it is weak, because after being unauthentic, a narration can still be Hasan. Therefore, if this narration is Hasan, then too it is sufficient."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 382]

Mufti Saheb should know that if a Muhaddith states **لایصح,** then he means nothing except just that. If the narration was *hasan* then the Muhaddith would most certainly have mentioned that. He would not have only said **لایصح.**

The research regarding practicing on weak Ahaadith

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan Saheb writes, *"Even if we assume that this narration is weak, then too insofar as Fadhail-e-A'maal (virtues of deeds) are concerned it will be taken into consideration."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 383]

Reply: This is another result of Mufti Saheb's warped intellect. To aver that for *Fadhail-e-A'maal* ever type of Hadith, without exception, is acceptable, is totally incorrect. Imaam Qaadhi ibn Al-Arabi Al-Maaliki (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 543 A.H.] and others, say regarding weak Ahaadith, *"It is not practiced upon, in general."* [Al-Qowlul Badee', page 195] As for those which are practiced upon, conditions are placed on it. Imaam Ibn Daqeequl Eid (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 702 A.H.] writes, *"Practice on weak Ahaadith is dependent on some conditions"* [Imaam, vol. 2, page 171]

What are those conditions? Imaam Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away in 902 A.H.] writes quoting from his Sheikh Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh), *"There are three conditions for practice on weak Ahaadith to be valid;* ***firstly,*** *that upon which all the Muhadditheen are unanimous that the Hadith is not extremely weak. Hence, if the narration has such a narrator who is a liar or is under suspicion of lying, or there is such a narrator who is prone to error, then such a narration will not be implemented.* ***Secondly,*** *that it is listed under general conditions, and whatever is without base is removed therefrom and it is not totally concocted.* ***Thirdly,*** *at the time of practice one should not have this belief that this is established from Nabi ρ, so that such a thing may not be attributed to Nabi ρ which may not be from him."* [Al-Qowlul Badee', page 195]

From this we gather that if any conditions are absent from a narration, then it should not be practiced upon. The last condition in particular should be taken note of, because if anything is not proven to be from Nabi ρ and this belief is adhered to that it is from him ρ, it is a great crime and sin and this falls under the Hadith of, *"He who falsely attributes to me…"*

Hadhrat Abdul Hayy Lucknowi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"There is unanimity that to invite towards practice on a weak Hadith for Fadhaail-e-A'maal is baatil. However, the Math-hab of the Jamhoor on this is that the narration must not be excessively weak, otherwise practice upon it for Fadhaail-e-A'maal also is not acceptable."* [Al-Aathaarul Marfoo'a fil Akhbaaril Maudoo'a, page 310]

It is so sad that the Ahle Bid`ah doggedly insist on establishing these weak narrations, by hook or by crook. This much should also be taken into consideration that although a weak narration may be permissible or mustahab if the above-mentioned conditions are implemented, it must not be a *maudoo'* narration. **If a narration is *maudoo'*, then it is most certainly not acceptable.** Haafidh Ibn Daqeequl Eid writes, *"If a narration is weak, but not maudoo', then it is permissible to practice upon it. However if any shi`aar of the Deen is created by its practice, then it should be abandoned."* [Ahkaamul Ahkaam, vol. 1, page 51]

Another salient point is extracted from this text, that a weak Hadith is only acceptable if it is not *maudoo'* or concocted, and together with this, is should not become of such a level that it is considered a *shi`aar* of the Deen. If there is a fear of it gaining the level of being a *shi`aar* of the Deen, then it must be stopped. The Ahle Bid`ah

practice on such things considering them to be Sunnat and they also chastise those who do not practice thereupon.

Allamah Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"It is permissible and Mustahab to practice on a weak Hadith for Fadhaail, Targheeb and Tarheeb (exhort and admonish), as long as it is not maudoo'."* [Al-Qowlul Badee', page 195]

"However, as for maudoo', practice on it is impermissible under all circumstances." [page 196]

In essence, not every weak Hadith is acceptable for *Fadhaail-e-A'maal*, in fact, the Muhadditheen has stipulated conditions for its acceptance. As for those narrations which are *maudoo'* and concocted, they are unacceptable under all circumstances, be it for *Fadhaail, Targheeb* or *Tarheeb.*

Take note that all the narrations regarding kissing the fingers during the Athaan are not merely weak, they are *maudoo'* or concocted.

Imaam Jalaaluddeen Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Those Ahaadith which have been narrated regarding kissing the fingers and rubbing them on the eyes during the Athaan when hearing the blessed name (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), are all maudoo'"* [Tayseerul Maqaal Al-Suyuti, page 123—1973 edition]

This issue is sealed and finalised. The Ahle bid`ah should take note and regain their Deeni senses.

Another weighty proof for kissing the fingers

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"My teacher and senior, Moulana Al-Haaj Sayyid Muhammad Naeemuddeen Muraadabaad said that there is an old Injeel, which has recently been revived and is being printed widely, entitled Injeel of Barnabas. It is also being translated into many languages. It chiefly comprises Islaamic teachings. In it is mentioned that Hadhrat Aadam υ, upon seeing the blessed soul ρ, had a desire and inclination towards it. The noor of this blessed soul then was made to shine from his nails. Out of love, he kissed his fingers and placed them on his eyes."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 379/80]

Molvi Muhammad Umar Saheb also mentions this, and he also cites the reference from the Scrolls of Barnabas [page 60]. He also quotes the text which appears to be from the Scrolls of Barnabas. It also has toe following, *"Then Aadam said in the form of an oath, O my Creator! Bless my nails with this script (name of Muhammad ρ', then Allaah Ta`ala blessed the first of mankind with this on his nails."* It states further, *"The first of mankind then, out of love, kissed his fingernails and placed them on his eyes."* [Miqyaas-e-Hanafiyat, page 604]

Even now if a person does not kiss his fingernails, it is his loss—This is the view of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan and ilk. They also aver further, *"This practice has been proven from authentic Ahaadith, Sufiya-e-Kiraam and Fuqahaa, and that it appears in the Scrolls of Barnabas. Subhaanallah! There is no sin in substantiating with the view of non-Muslims…"* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 384] *Laa Howla wa Laa Quwwata Illa billa hil alaiyil Azeem*!
One can see the mentality and arguments of the Ahle Bid`ah. **Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan should know that whatever Nabi ρ omitted is also Sunnat. According to the Fuqahaa, if Nabi ρ did not do an act then it is a proof for its *karaahat*. This is not any recent finding,**

but a view of all the Fuqahaa throughout the centuries that practice on *maudoo'* and concocted narrations is not permissible.

The chapter on writing on a shroud

After giving ghusal to the deceased, to shroud the body according to the Sunnat is established in the Ahaadith. This has also been established that as a form of blessing, one may place another cloth with the shroud, as has been done by Nabi ρ for his daughter Hadhrat Zainub τ. As a form of blessing, one may place the cloth of some pious person with the bier, as Imaam Bukhaari (rahmatullah alayh) proves by citing a Hadith. Similarly, this practice has been borne out by the bequest made by Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Muaawiya τ, etc. for a piece of cloth from Nabi ρ to be placed in their graves. The point here is that innumerable people passed away in the presence of Nabi ρ, Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) and were buried. During that time too, the deceased were enshrouded in *kafn* and people during those eras also knew how to write. They knew, even better than us, the Kalimah Tayyibah, and they held it even closer to their hearts than we do today. Similarly they also memorised *Durood Shareef*, *Tasbeeh, Tahleel*, etc. They were well aware of the hereafter and life in the grave. They also buried their near and dear ones. They were also, after the demise of their close ones, in mourning for many days wondering what their respective conditions in their graves may be. They were also concerned about their Aakhirah. **They, however, never wrote on the shrouds neither did they ever instruct others to do so.** How then, do all these accretions become acceptable and permissible in these days? Not only have they become permissible, but they have been granted the status of necessity and wujoob.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"It is necessary to write the 'ad naama on the kafan etc. of the deceased."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 325]

"Those proofs which have been recorded for writing on the shroud, which Imaam Hakeem Tirmidhi (rahmatullah alayh) states in Nawaadirul Usool, that the person who writes the dua on a piece of paper and places it between the chest and shroud of the deceased, it will save him from the punishment in the grave and he will not see munkar and nakeer." [Jaa-al Haqq, page 323]

All these points are without substantiation. As mentioned previously from Imaam Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh) that to attribute any narration to the likes of Hakeem Tirmidhi, etc. is sufficient to render it weak and feeble.

In essence, whatever claim and references the Ahle Bid`ah forward in substantiation of their fallacies, our answer and reply to them is always the same---**Whatever Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah τ, Tabieen and Tabe Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim) did not do, notwithstanding the reasons and possibilities of them being able to do it having existed during their eras, is not permissible for us to initiate today.** The dream, statement and action of any sufi to the contrary is also not sufficient to override the Sunnat.

The ruling of Isaal-e-Thawaab through bodily and material means

There is unanimity amongst the majority Ahle-Islaam is that Isaal-e-Thawaab for the deceased is permissible and correct. Regardless of whether this is executed in bodily form or materially. However, insofar as physical Ibaadat (like Salaat, fasting, Tilaawat, etc.) there exists a difference of opinion between Imaams Maalik and Shaafi'

(rahmatullah alayhima). [Sharah Fiqh Akbar, page 157 / Kitaabur Rooh, page 145].

Nevertheless, the majority of Shawaafi' and Maalikis agree with the Jamhoor on this mas'alah. Haafidh Ibn Qayyim (rahmatullah alayh) has, in Kitaabur Rooh on pages 145 to 177, dilated on all the *naqli* and *aqli* aspects of this issue. The truth and closest to the truth is that all bodily and material forms of Isaal-e-Thawaab reach and benefit the deceased. There are, however some basic and principle conditions which need to be considered. As long as these conditions are not adhered to, there will be no benefit:

1. The deceased has to (have been) a Mu'min of valid and proper beliefs, even though he/she may have been a sinner. Similarly the person who is sending the Isaal-e-Thawaab must also be a Mu'min of proper and valid Aqeedah, otherwise all efforts will be fruitless.
2. There should be absolutely no question of show, name and fame, personal benefit, etc. in this act. It should also not be done so as to save oneself from bad thoughts of others. There should, in essence, be no ulterior hidden motive.
3. Any wealth which is given in charity and Sadaqah should be Halaal and clean wealth. Impure, Haraam and ill-gotten wealth is, according to the Hadith and Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam most certainly not acceptable in the Sight of Allaah Ta`ala.
4. That wealth which is given in Isaal-e-Thawaab should be free from the rights of anyone. That is, it should not be usurped wealth or taken from the inheritance of immature persons. Besides this deed being Haraam, it will also be a means of punishment.

5. Any recitation of the Qur`aan Majeed which is undertaken for the benefit of the deceased should be executed without any fee or paying someone to recite.
6. No specific dates or times should be stipulated for the execution of any acts of Isaal-e-Thawaab.
7. Any food given in this avenue should only be given to the poor and needy. It should not be fed to friends and wealthy.

Some of these pointers are clearly extracted from the Qur`aan Majeed and Ahaadith. Some are inferred. Take a look now at some references:

It is stated in the Qur`aan Majeed, *"Do not give (in the Path of Allaah Ta`ala) any filth (Haraam, impure and ill-gotten) wealth."*

It is stated in the Hadith Shareef, *"Allaah does not accept Sadaqah from Haraam wealth"* [Tirmidhi, vol. 1, page 2] Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"If the faqeer (poor person) knows that the charity he is receiving is from Haraam and yet he makes dua for the donor, who says 'Aameen' to his dua, then both of them are kaafir."* [Sharah Fiqh Akbar, page 23]

This is also stated in Fataawa Aalamgiri, vol. 2, page 299]

Imaam Qadhi Khaan writes, *"If food is prepared from the estate of the deceased then this will be fine, as long as there are no immature persons amongst the heirs. If there is even one immature person amongst the heirs, then no food should be prepared from the wealth of the estate of the deceased."* [Fataawa Qaadhi Khaan, vol. 4, page 781] Allamah Shaami (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"The Hadith of Hadhrat Jareer τ proves the karaahat, especially when*

there are any immature or absent persons amongst the heirs." [Shaami, vol. 1, page 841]

Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) writes, *"In fact it is established from the narration of Hadhrat Jareer τ that the Sahaabah τ regarded eating at the deceased's home as niyaahat (professional mourning) and this proves that partaking of such food is Haraam. Imaam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) states that such food is Makrooh. I say that the Karaahat is only when there exists an immature or absent person amongst the heirs. If there are such persons, then this food is undoubtedly Haraam."* [Mirqaat alal Mishkaat, vol. 1, page 151]

From these texts we ascertain that if all the heirs of the deceased are present and mature persons, then too, to partake of such food at the deceased's home is Makrooh, in fact, it could also be classified as Haraam. However, if there are immature persons amongst the heirs or any of the heirs are not present (so as to give consent), then such food is undoubtedly Haraam. Such food, is also impermissible for the poor and needy.

Taking remuneration for recitation of Qur`aan Majeed

To recite the Qur`aan Majeed is one great ibaadat. It also reaps reap benefit for the deceased if it recited fro Isaal-e-Thawaab, on the proviso that no remuneration is given for the recitation. Whether the remuneration was stipulated before the recitation or after, the ruling applies. As is customary in most places (still in India), where it is an acceptable norm that the reciters will receive something in return for their recital. In this regard, Mahmood bin Ahmad Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 673 A.H.] states in the Sharah of Hidaayah, *"Indeed that Qur`aan*

Majeed recitation which is made for remuneration benefits neither the deceased nor the reciter." [Anwaarus Saati'a, page 107]

Allamah A'ini Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Both, the reciter and payer, for the recitation of the Qur`aan Majeed, are sinners. In essence, the recitation of the Qur`aan Majeed which is done for remuneration nowadays, is not permissible."* [Binaaya, Sharah Hidaaya, vol. 3, page 255]

This mas'alah has been fully expounded and dilated by Allamah Shaami (rahmatullah alayh). Refer to his famous work.

Moulana Abdul Hayy Lucknowi (rahmatullah alayh) has cited references from numerous sources proving that the recitation of the Qur`aan Majeed and Thikr which is carried out in lieu of remuneration neither benefit the deceased nor the reciter. [Majmoo-al Fataawa, vol. 2, page 87]

Haafidh Ibn Qayyim (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It is correct that the recitation of the Qur`aan Majeed which is carried out without remuneration, is a source of blessing for the deceased. The reward thereof reaches them, just as the reward for fasting and hajj reaches them."* [Kitaabur Rooh, page 175]

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"To recite the Qur`aan Majeed purely for the Pleasure of Allaah Ta`ala, without taking any remuneration is correct and benefits the deceased."* [Sharah Fiqh-e-Akbar, page 160]
Allamah Sadruddeen Ali bin Muhammad Ad-Dimishqi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 746 A.H] writes,

"To recite the Qur`aan Majeed for remuneration and passing the reward on for the deceased, was never done by any of our Salf, and none of our Aimmah-e-Deen have instructed or consented to it. Remuneration for actual Qur`aan Majeed recitation is impermissible. There is no difference of opinion on this." [Sharah Aqeedatut Tahaawi, page 386]

Note

The remuneration for teaching Qur`aan Majeed, giving Athaan, being an Imaam or Qaadhi etc. are all permissible. The Khulafaa-e-Raashideen had, during their respective eras appointed such persons and stipulated wages for them. If this was ever impermissible, then the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen would never have carried it out. Their actions are also part of the Sunnat for us, according to the Hadith if Nabi ρ. They were our beacons of guidance.

Imaam Abul Farj Abdur Rahmaan Ibn Jowzi Al-Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 597 A.H.] states, *"Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab and Uthmaan bin Affaan used to employ Muath-thins, Imaams and teachers."* [Seeratul Umrain, Ibn Jowzi, page 165]

Imaam Jamaluddeen Abu Muhammad Abdullaah bin Yusuf Az-Zaila'I Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 762 A.H.] states that Hadhrat Umar τ used to compensate the teachers. [Nasbur Ra'ya, vol. 4, page 137]

Similarly there are numerous references to substantiate this practice from the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam.

Imaam Abu Ubaid Qaasim bin Sallaam (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 224 A.H.] states, *"Hadhrat Umar τ used to write to his governors instructing them to employ*

people to teach the Qur`aan Majeed." [Kitaabul Amwaal, page 261]

Some governors wrote back and told Hadhrat Umar τ that many people will only teach because of this remuneration and not because of fervour or love for imparting knowledge and this attitude would be to the detriment of the students. Notwithstanding this, Hadhrat Umar τ did not discontinue from this practice.

Hadhrat Umar ibn Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) also appointed people for teaching the Qur`aan Majeed and fixed a fee for them. Some people, however did not accept this fee and others did.

Qaadhi Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdullaah Ibn Arabi Maaliki (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 543 A.H] states whilst discussing this mas'alah, that the correct view is that it is completely permissible to accept remuneration for the duties of Athaan, Salaat, Qadhaa (judges) and all other Deeni duties, because the Ameerul Mu'mineen used to practice this. [Neelil Autaar, vol. 2, page 61]

This is the view of Imaams Maalik, Shaafi, Ibn Hambal, Is`haq, Abu Thaur, and other Salf-e-Saaliheen. Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) has forbidden from taking remuneration for teaching Qur`aan Majeed, but he consented to taking a fee for giving ta'weez. [Sharah Muslim, vol. 2, page 224]

All these references prove that it is permissible to give and take remuneration for the duties of Imaamat, Athaan, teaching, judging, etc. And this was the practice of the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen.

The mas'alah of remuneration and Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh)

The reference of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) has passed above and just like him, many other Ulama have prohibited from remuneration for teaching Qur`aan Majeed. Have they forbidden this because it is contrary to Taqwa and piety? Or perhaps have they forbidden this only for the wealthy? Or have the forbidden remuneration in lieu for any Deeni service in general? Or is it because the poor and needy persons who rendered Deeni service during the *Khairul Quroon* used to receive a stipend from the Baitul Maal and to stipulate a fee especially for the Deeni was Makrooh? The basis for Imaam Saheb's Fatwa could be due to various possibilities and reasons, which also led to some Fuqahaa-e-Ahnaaf to render remunerations for teaching Qur`aan Majeed as Makrooh. The concept of Baitul Maal slowly dissipated and is non-existent today. The Fuqhaa-e-Kiraam have reflected carefully on this mas'alah, and have eventually given a unanimous ruling of permissibility. In this regard, Imaam Qaadhi Khaan Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Without doubt, the Mutaqaddimeen used to regard the giving of remuneration for teaching the Qur`aan Majeed as Makrooh. They also regarded taking remuneration as Makrooh, because during that era the teachers would receive a stipend from the Baitul Maal and also those personalities had great enthusiasm and desire for rendering service to the Deen, whereas in our time, this stipend has been halted and people's fervour for rendering Deeni service has also dwindled. Therefore if these people have to spend their time in rendering service to the Deen, their ability to earn a living will be severely handicapped. This is the reason why we have said that this employment is correct and remuneration for Deeni teachers is Waajib. Therefore if the student's father (or in our time the principal,*

Madrasah, etc) abstains from giving the teacher a remuneration for his services, then he will be arrested.” [Fataawa Qaadhi Khaan, vol. 3, page 434]

Allamah Ibn Nujaim Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh), known as Abu Hanifah the second, said, *“The preferred ruling in our time is that it is permissible for the (Deeni) teacher Muath-thin, Imaam and Mufti to take a remuneration for Deeni services rendered.”* [Bahrur Raa’iq, vol. 1, page 254]

The Author of Hidaayah also gives a similar ruling that it is permissible. [Hidaayah, vol. 4, page 15]

Allamah Badruddeen Aini (rahmatullah alayh) also gives the ruling of permissibility. [See Binaaya, Sharah of Hidaayah, vol. 3, page 655]

Note: It is permissible to take a remuneration for reciting Qur`aan Majeed or writing a Ta’weez for a person who is ill or is afflicted with some calamity. The narration in Bukhaari Shareef, vol. 2, page 854, which states, *“The most worthy thing for which you should take remuneration is the Kitaabullaah”*, is proof of this. However, one should keep in mind that this remuneration which is taken is for the practice of giving Ta’weez and practicing some *amal*. It is not for the purpose of Isaal-e-Thawaab.

Sheikhul Islaam, Ibn Taimia (rahmatullah alayh) states, *“The objective here is only for (giving of) Ta’weez and not for recitation.”* [Fataawa, vol. 2, page 198]

Allamah Azeezi (rahmatullah alayh) comments on this saying that remuneration for recitation of Qur`aan Majeed for the purpose of Ta’weez is permissible. [As-Siraajul Muneer, vol. 1, page 485]

To specify days for making Isaal-e-Thawaab

To supplicate for the deceased, seek forgiveness for them, give charity and alms on their behalf, to recite the Qur'aan Majeed ---are all forms of *Isaal-e-Thawaab*. Similarly, to perform Nafl Salaat, fast and Hajj on their behalf so that they receive the reward are all permissible and correct. The Shariah has however not specified any specific day or time for the execution of *Isaal-e-Thawaab*. It has passed previously that such stipulation is bid'ah. **There is no proof from any of the four sources of the Shariah that it is necessary to specify a time for the execution of *Isaal-e-Thaawab*.** However, this much is discerned that this custom has been copied from the Hindus, because according to them there are specific days for the execution of *Isaal-e-Thawaab*. In this regard, the famous historian, Allamah Berooni (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 330 A.H] states that the according to the Hindus, amongst the rights of the deceased upon the relatives is that they entertain and on the 11th and 15th day after their death they serve food. The 6th day of every month has virtue for them. Similarly, it is also necessary to serve food at the end of the year. For nine days after the demise, food must be prepared in the home and the fires kept burning, otherwise the soul of the deceased will be displeased and it will roam around the house in a state of hunger and thirst. On the 19th and 11th days plenty food must be prepared. It is also written that sweetmeats be prepared and it is also stated that the eating and drinking container of the brahman be kept separate. [Kitaabul Hind, page 270, 282]

The Muslims have also now adopted this custom. They place sweetmeats and water (by the grave) and leave separate containers for the Mullahjee. They also stipulate the days, that this is done on the 10th and 11th day, and that every year-end an *Urs* take place. The famous new

Muslim, who concerted from being a Hindu priest, Moulana Ubaidulah Saheb (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"After the death of a brahman, the 11th day is specified, after the death of a 'katri' the 13th day, after the death of a banya etc. the 15th day or 16th day is specified..."[Tuhfatul Hind, page 91]*--In short all these customs are in vogue amongst the Hindus, which the Muslims today are imitating to the tee.

Whatever the Hindus get their pundits to do, the Muslims depute their Mullahjee to do. In place of the Hindu incantations, the Mullahjee will recite Qur'aan Majeed. How sad that non-Muslim customs are adopted by Muslims and given an Islamic hue. And nowadays when these acts are criticised, it is regarded as though we are criticising Islaam.

The discussion on gathering in the home of the deceased and cooking food there

The texts of the Hadith and Fiqh bear testimony to the fact that whenever a person passes away, then due to the grief being experienced by the family members, the neighbours and people of the locality should prepare food and send to the home of the bereaved and also that those who could not present themselves for the Janaaza Salaat, can also make Ta'ziyat (sympathise and console the bereaved). However, to gather at the home of the bereaved, and have food prepared there is a great sin. This accretion takes place in many places such that the unfortunate people even incur debts, in order to satisfy this customary practice. Sometimes, loans on interest are even taken out. Similarly, the wealth of the heirs, especially the orphans, is misappropriated in this way. Hadhrat Jareer bin Abdillah τ [passed away 51 A.H] narrates, *"We would regard the gathering at the home of the bereaved and preparing food*

there as being 'Niyaaha' (a part of professional mourning, which is strictly forbidden)." [Ibn Majah, page 117 / Musnad Ahmad, vol. 2, page 204]

It is stated in the kitaab, *Muntaqil Akhbaar* on page 122 that to prepare food after the burial is part of *Niyaahah*.

It is stated in a *marfoo'* Hadith that to cry audibly on a deceased, call professional mourners, etc. are the signs and traits of the people of ignorance. To make '*Noha'* is Haraam according to the *khalaf* and *salaf*. Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullahi alaih) states that there is unanimity on the hurmat of *noha*. [Sharah Muslim, vol. 1, page 303]

Preparing of food in the home of the deceased also falls within the ambit of the same prohibition. This narration has been reported via two channels. Allamah Haithami (rahmatullahi alaih) states regarding one of the two chains that it complies to the principles of Bukhaari and is authentic, and that the second conforms to the standards of Imaam Muslim (rahmatullahi alaihima). Haafidh Ibn Humaam (rahmatullahi alaih) states that this narration is authentic. [Fathul Qadeer, vol. 1, page 473] Allamah Halbi also authenticates it. [Kabeeri, page 609]

From this we gather that to gather at the home of the bereaved and to prepare food there for everyone, was regarded by the Sahaabah τ as being part of *Noha,* and its sin was just as bad. There is also consensus and unanimity on this. Although there is no need for it, nevertheless, we will present here excerpts from the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam, so that this mas`alah is resolved and becomes clear as daylight.

Allamah Ibn Ameerul Haaj Al-Maaliki (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 737 A.H] states, *"There is nothing reported*

regarding the bereaved preparing food for all and sundry and for people to gather there. Infact, this is a bid'ah, which is not Mustahab." [Mudkhal, vol. 3, page 275]

Imaam Ibn Hajar Makki Shaafi (rahmatullahi alaih) was asked, *"What is the ruling regarding the food which is prepared for the poor on the third and seventh day after a person's demise?"* He replied, *"All which takes place regarding that which has been asked is an evil bid'ah."* [Fataawa Kubra, vol. 2, page 7]

Allamah Muhammad bin Muhammad Hambali (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 777 A.H] states in *Tasleeyatul Masaa'ib*, page 99, and Imaam Shamsuddeen bin Qudaama Hambali (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 682 A.H.] states in *Sharah Muqna'i lil Kabeer,* vol. 2, page 426, and Imaam Muwaffiquddeen bin Qudaama (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 620 A.H], write, *"However that food which the bereaved prepare for the people, it is Makrooh, because indeed this increases in their trauma and occupation and it is an imitation of the people of ignorance."* [Mughni, vol. 2, page 413]

Allamah Ibn Aabideen Shaami (rahmatullahi alaihi) writes, *"This is (the ruling) according to our Math-hab and that of others besides us, like the Shaafi's and Hambalis."* [vol. 1, page 841]

Since we have thoroughly studied one Math-hab, i.e. Hanafi Fiqh, we present here the proofs in accordance to our Math-hab.

Eating at the house of the bereaved, having 'saatwa', 'chaaliswa', etc. according to the Hanafi Fuqahaa

Just as the Fuqahaa of all the other Mathaahib have refuted these acts of bid'ah, so too, in fact, more so, have the Fuqahaa of the Hanafi Math-hab. In this regard, Allamah Taahir bin Ahmad Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"It is not permissible to entertain for three days, because indeed entertaining is only done during times of happiness."* [Khulaasatul Fataawa, vol. 2, page 342]

In many villages, the custom of preparing elaborate meals and the like is practiced. All the towns people participate therein. Not only that, but even the big turbaned Ulama partake therein. May Allaah Ta'ala save us all from these evil innovations.

Imaam Qaadhi Khaan (rahmatullahi alaih) states, *"It is Makrooh to entertain during the days of grief and mourning, because indeed these are times of grieving and it is inappropriate to enact acts of happiness, during this time."* [Fataawa Khaaniya, vol. 4, page 781]

A very similar text is reported in Fataawa Siraajiya on page 75.

Haafidh Ibn Humaam (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"It is Makrooh for the bereaved to entertain, because this has been prescribed for times of grief and not happiness. This is an evil bid'ah."* [Fat-hul Qadeer, vol. 1, page 473]

Allamah Qahastaani (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"It is Makrooh to entertain during these days, and similarly partaking of such food, as is mentioned in 'Kairatul Fataawa'."* [Jaamiur Rumuz, vol. 3, page 443]
It is stated in Fataawa Aalamgiri, *"It is not permissible to prepare food for three days (in the home of the bereaved). Similar is reported in Taatarkhaaniya."* [vol. 1, page 167]

Imaam Haafidudeen Muhammad bin Shihaab Kardari Al-Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"It is makrooh to prepare a feast for three days (at the home of the bereaved) and to partake of it, because it (entertaining) is prescribed for happiness. It is also Makrooh to prepare food on the first, second or third days. Similarly after a week, on the occasion of Eid ('first Eid') and to seasonally take food to the gravesite. It is also Makrooh to call the pious and Qaaris to recite the Qur'aan Majeed. It is also Makrooh to recite Surahs An'aam and Ikhlaas and prepare food. The objective is that it is Makrooh to recite the Qur'aan Majeed at the time of preparation, with the objective of eating it."* [Fataawa Bazaazia, vol. 4, page 81]

Text with similar import is reported in Shaami, vol. 1, page 841.

Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullahi alaih), writes in *Sharah Minhaaj*, *"To gather at the gravesite on the third day, to distribute scent-sticks there, to feed bread on specific days, like on teeja, paaanchwa, daswa, beeswa and chaaliswa. All these are prohibited bid'ahs."* [Anwaarus Saatia, page 105]

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullahi alaih) states whilst citing the narration of Hadhrat Aasim bin Kulaib (rahmatullahi alaihim), *"The Fuqahaa of our math-hab have confirmed that it is Makrooh (for the bereaved) to entertain on the first day, third day and after a week."* [Mirqaat, vol. 5, page 482]

From all these texts it is established that it is impermissible for the bereaved to prepare food on specific days after the funeral.

It is stated in the Malfoothaat of Hadhrat Makhdoom Jahaniya Jahaa Ghasht (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 800A.H], *"Nowadays on the third day after the funeral, people take sarbat, fruits, etc. when visiting the graves, and they eat...they also take a box...all this is Makrooh."* [Ad-Durrul Manzoom, page 783]

Allamah Muhyuddin Barkali Naqshbandi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 981 A. H.] writes, *"Amongst the bid'ahs is to make a bequest to entertain on the day of the demise and thereafter, and also to give money to those who recite Qur'aan and Kalimah, and to keep people attendant at the graveside for 40days, and to build domes on the graves, etc. All these acts are detestable"* [Tareeqah Muhammadi, last page]

Respected Readers! You have seen from the texts of the Fuqaha and Sufiya, that to enjoy food at the home of the deceased, to practice *sowm, daham, chahalam, barsi*, etc. are bid'ah and Makrooh. But alas, the perpetrators of these acts label all those who do not join them as Wahhabis, etc.

The first objection of the opposition

The opposite party claim that it is not Makrooh and permissible to eat at the home of the deceased, because there is a narration in Mishkaat Shareef, in vol. 2, page 544, whose crux is that when Nabi ρ once returned from burying someone, the wife of the deceased sent a messenger to invite Nabi ρ. Allamah Halbi, states in Kabeeri, page 609 and Sagheeri, page 300, and Mullah Ali Qaari states in Mirqaat, page 482 that this Hadith proves that it is permissible to eat at the home of the deceased, otherwise, Nabi ρ would most certainly not have eaten there. [Anwaarus Saatia, page 109]

Reply:

To eke out a proof from this narration is incorrect. **Firstly,** because the word *'imra-atihi'* is either an error of the author of Mishkaat or a typographical one. The actual narration has the word, *'imra-atin'*, which would mean that the messenger of a woman invited Nabi ρ. As for the wife of the deceased sending an invitation to Nabi ρ, this is incorrect. This narration appears in the following Kitaabs, Abu Dawood, vol. 2, page 117, Mushkilul Aathaar, vol.2, page 132, Mu'tasir, page 169, Sharah Ma-aniul Aathaar, vol. 2, page 320, Daarul Qutni, vol. 2, page 545, Musnad Ahmad, vol. 5, page 293, Sunnanul Kubra, vol. 6, page 97, Khasaaisul Kubra, vol. 2, page 103, Mustadrak Haakim, vol. 4, page 234, Muhalla bin Hazam, vol. 7, page 415, Aunul Ma'bood, vol. 3, page 249, Bazlul Majhood, vol. 4, page 239, etc. In all these Kitaabs the narration appears with the word, *'imra-atin'*, which is the correct version. The version which indicates the pronoun referring to the wife of the deceased is incorrect.

Secondly, those who have considered the word to be *'imra-atihi'*, have forwarded various interpretations. Some have said that this was a unique situation relating to Nabi ρ. Some said one thing and some another. Some have permitted the eating at the house of the deceased based on some flimsy interpretation. The high priest of the Ahle Bid'ah, Hadhrat Khaan Saheb Barelwi, has opined that this particular lady had invited Nabi ρ to a meal before her husband passed away. It just so transpired that her husband passed away at the appointed time of the invitation, hence Nabi's ρ presence for the meal was not because of the funeral, but rather to fulfill the previous invitation.

This humble writer is of the view that the initial view is the more correct and appropriate one, that Nabi ρ did not eat at

the house of the deceased. Mullah Ali Qaari, who was initially of the view that Nabi ρ ate at the home of the deceased, has retracted from this view in one of his last works. He has stated in Shar-e-Niqaya, vol. 1, page 140 that it is makrooh to eat at the home of the deceased and that it is a bid'ah.

Second objection

The Ahle Bid'ah claim that the prohibition for the occasions of *teeja, daswa, chaaliswa*, etc. which appear in the various texts, refers to the entertainment afforded to guests and family. He says that the Fuqahaa have explicitly stated that it is a laudable deed to prepare food for the poor and needy. Also that in the text of Shah Waliullaah Saheb, the reference to waste and extravagance is made and that they also discourage waste. He also claims that the text of Qaadhi Thanaullaah (rahmatullahi alaih) prohibit worldly customs, where women gather on those days and mourn. He says that actual *teeja* is not prohibited. [Anwaarus Saatia, page 106, 113, 115 / Jaa-al Haqq, page 255/6]

Reply:

Without doubt, to entertain guests and family during the days of grief is bid'ah and prohibited. It is also sinful to waste and gather womenfolk. It is also acceptable if the mature heirs consent to feeding the poor and needy. Nevertheless, focus should also not be lost to the fact that it is Makrooh and a bid'ah to appoint and specify dates and days for this. **It is stated in the texts of the Fuqahaa that to specify days for the various customs, is a bid'ah and prohibited.**

We need to clarify here that the mas'alah of *Isaal-e-Thawaab* is haqq and valid, however, to specify particular

days and occasions for doing it is not only foolish, but Makrooh and a bid'ah as well.

Third objection

The opposition party claim that when Nabi's ρ son, Ebrahim passed away, then on the third day after his demise, Hadhrat Abu Zarr τ presented some dates, milk and barley bread before Nabi ρ, who recited Surah Faatiha and *Qul Huwallaahu Ahad* and made dua. Nabi ρ then told Hadhrat Abu Zarr τ to distribute it amongst the poor and that the reward thereof will reach his beloved son, Ebrahim. They say that this narration proves *teeja* and the practice of making khatam on food.

Reply:

Moulana Abdul Hayy Lucknowi (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"This narration is neither authentic nor reliable. In fact, it is concocted and fabricated. It cannot be relied upon. There is no sign of any narration like this in any Hadith Kitaab."* [Majmooa Fataawa, vol. 2, page 74]

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan further claims that it is stated in Anwaarus Saatia, page 145 that Nabi ρ gave sadqah on the third, seventh, fortieth and year-end after the demise of Ameer Hamzah τ. He says that this is the source for *teeja, shesh maai and barsi*. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 250]

Mufti Saheb should be made aware that Masaail are not solved by the use of concocted and false narrations. If a Hadith is presented then it should be with a reliable and authentic chain of narrators and it should be reported by reliable Muhadditheen. just by saying and claiming something to be a Hadith is insufficient.

Note: It has become customary amongst the masses to give alms and charity on a Friday night. This practice has no basis in the Shariah.

To make Khatam on food which is presented as Isaal-e-Thawaab for the deceased

This issue is established from authentic Ahaadith, that Nabi ρ also recited *Bismillah* on his food (i.e. before eating) and also various other duas for different foods. Sometimes he even recited certain duas in order to increase the food. All these issues are beyond the scope of our argument. **The argument or bone of contention here is the validity of reciting something over the food which is presented for Isaal-e-Thawaab for the deceased.** The question is whether Nabi ρ or the Sahaabah τ did this or not? The simple and concise answer to this is that it is not established in the Shariah. In fact, it is a bid'ah. In this regard it is stated in Fataawa Samarqandiya, *"The recitation of Surahs Faatiha, Ikhlaas and Kaafiroon on food is bid'ah."* [Al-Junna, page 155]

The famous Barelwi Aalim, Molvi Muhammad Salih Sahib writes regarding reciting over food, *"This custom is not practiced throughout the Islamic world, besides India."* [Tuhfatul Ahbaab, page 122]

When this practice is not established from Nabi ρ, the Sahaabah τ or the Khairul Quroon, and the Fuqahaa of the Ahnaaf have labelled it a bid'ah, and the Barelvi Aalim has conceded that, besides India, it is non-existent elsewhere, is it logical to advocate it, call it a sign of the Ahnaaf and call the non-participants Wahaabis, etc.? In fact, the logical deduction and closest to the truth is that this custom has been copied from the Hindus. They recite their own incantations on the food, whereas the Muslims recite the

Qur'aan Majeed. The Hindus have the pundit to carry out the task and the Muslims have the Haafiz Saheb or Molvi Saheb.

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes that there is no harm in reciting over the food for Isaal-e-Thawaab, and similarly to stand in front of the grave and make dua. [Jaa-al Haqq, page 254]

He has not considered the matter thoroughly. To place the Janaazah in front and make dua (Salaat) is a Sunnah established from the lives of Nabi ρ and the Sahaabah τ. However, to place the food of Isaal-e-Thawaab in front of one and recite over it is most certainly not established. In fact, this is a bid'ah.

To spread the mat

When someone close or connected to one passes away, then to console the bereaved and invoke patience on them is a Sunnah practice. This is also to be practiced within the bounds and limits of the Shariah. Whether it is done in the Masjid or the home, ***Ta'ziyat* is only for three days.** The practice of sitting around, spreading the mats and gathering, smoking hukka, etc. are all acts of bid'ah. It is extremely necessary to abstain from such acts. Imaam Fakhruddeen Uthmaan bin Ali Az-Zaila'ee Al-Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 724 A. H.] writes, *"There is no harm in sitting for three days (for ta'ziyat). But there should be no special arrangements be made for seating and eating, as these practices are forbidden. The family of the bereaved should not be expected to entertain, because this is only done at times of happiness."* [Tabyeenul Haqaaiq, vol. 1, page 246]

It is stated in Fataawa Hindiya, *"There is no harm if the family of the bereaved sit in the home or Masjid (not women) for three days (for ta'ziyat), so that the people can visit and console them. It is Makrooh to sit at the doorstep and do as is done in the foreign places where a mat is placed and people sit there and others stand on the road. These are amongst the worst of acts."* [Aalimgiri, vol. 1, page 177]

These texts indicate to the fact that *ta'ziyat* only includes visiting the bereaved during the first three days and consoling them and advising them to adopt patience. As for all the other customs and practices which take place on these occasions, like sitting around, placing mats, entertaining guests, etc. are all forbidden and bid'ahs.

Note: It is permissible to raise the hands and make dua for the deceased. Nabi ρ did also raise his hands when making dua for the deceased [see Bukhaari Shareef, vol. 2, page 619 and Muslim Shareef, vol. 2, page 303]

Hadhrat Shah Muhammad Is'haq Saheb (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 1262 A.H.] states that it is permissible to raise the hands and make dua for the deceased during *ta'ziyat*. [Masaail Arbaeen, page 34] It has also been established from Nabi ρ to raise the hands when making dua for the deceased at the grave. [Muslim, vol. 1, page 313]

An appropriate and suitable plan for fulfilling the dues of the deceased

This issue has been dealt with before that to give alms and charity on behalf of the deceased is a great deed and an

invaluable favour rendered upon the deceased. This has been established from the Shariah Nusoos. The Ahle Sunnat Wal Jamaat are unanimous on this mas'alah. **However, only those forms of Isaal-e-Thawaab are valid which are proven in the Shariah.** If a mature person has some Salaat still outstanding and happens to pass away in this state, then the Fuqahaa have made qiyaas on *fidyah* for fasts and devised a compensation for missed Salaats. Besides the Qiyaas, the narrations of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas and Ibn Umar τ also indicate this, *"It has been reported that Ibn Abbaas τ said, 'No one can perform Salaat for another nor fast for another. But yes, he can feed (i.e. give fidyah) for another."* [Mushkilul Aathaar, vol. 3, page 141 / Sunanul Kubra, vol.4, page 257 / Jouharun Naqi, vol. 4, page 257 / Sunanuz Zaila'i, vol. 2, page 463]

Allamah Maarooni (rahmatullahi alaih) states that this narration conforms to the conditions of Bukhaari and Muslim [Al Jauhar, vol. 4, page 257] and Haafidh Ibn Hajar (rahmatullahi alaih) says that the narration is authentic [Ad-Diraaya, page 177]

"It has been reported that Ibn Umar said, 'No person can perform Salaat for another and no person can fast for another, but if you wish to do (something for the deceased) then give sadqah for him/her or give hadya/fidyah for him/her." [Ibid]

The compensation for every days fast is half saa' of wheat. A saa' is 270 tolas. The Fuqahaa have mentioned that every person should calculate his / her missed Salaat and fast and make a bequest for it to be compensated for in one's will. [See Khaniya, vol. 1,page 96 / Jamiur Rumuz, vol. 1, page 161 and Noorul Idaa, page 104]

If a bequest is not made and the heirs give the fidyah from their own, then too it will be permissible and valid. In this way, also the deceased will reap the benefit. The fidyah for every Salaat is also 1/2 saa' and Witr Salaat is counted separately. If a person passes away without having any missed fasts or Salaats, then no fidyah needs to be given. If a person was wealthy and if his/her fidyah can be fulfilled from the 1/3 share, without having to deprive the heirs of any of their share, then well and good. However, if the deceased was a poor person whose third of estate does not cover the fidyah of all missed fasts and Salaat, then the Fuqahaa-e-Kiraam have devised a plan whereby this can be done. Whatever wheat or its value of fidyah the person's estate allows, should be taken out and the heirs should give it to one poor person, who will in turn gift it back. The heir will again give it to the poor person who will gift it back again. This exchange will take place as long as it takes for the entire amount owing in fidyah to be fulfilled. This plan has been outlined in numerous Hanafi Kitaabs. For example see *Kabeeri*, page 535, *Shaami*, vol. 1, page 492 and *Noorul Idaa*, page 104. The Fuqahaa have also written that if this compensates for the deceased's missed Salaat, then well and good, but any way he will receive the reward of Sadqah. The undermentioned points are gleaned from the various works:

1). A proper and relatively accurate estimation of missed fasts and Salaats must be calculated. A mere external and facade of fidyah must not be made.

2). A bequest must be made to the heirs that they use 1/3 of the estate to pay the fidyah amount.

3). As for the person who has no outstanding Salaat and fast, there is no need for fidyah. There are many people who have fulfilled all their missed Ibaadaat during their

lifetime, or since maturity have never missed anything. As for a minor or insane person, there is no responsibility for such Ibaadat.

4). Only for that poor person whose estate does not cover all his fidyah amount, have the Fuqahaa devised this plan. This plan should never be abused by the rich and wealthy.

5). This fidyah is only applicable to Huqooqullaah and not to Huqooqul Ibaad. If money is owed to people, then it has to be paid in full, If the creditors waive the debt, then well and good. The last time the exchange takes place between the heir and poor person where the fidyah amount is finally fulfilled, this wheat or money now becomes the property of the poor person. It most certainly does not become the heir's property where they now distribute that amount amongst themselves. Nabi ρ said, *"The person who gifts something and then takes it back is like that dog which regurgitates and consumes its own spew."* [Bukhaari, vol. 1, page 357 / Muslim vol. 2, page 36]

Some Ulama have exceeded the bounds by stating, *"If the deceased does not have any estate, then his heirs should borrow money and pay his fidyah."* [Jaamiur Rumuz, vol. 1,page 162]

Molvi Muhammad Saalih Barelwi states *"If the deceased's estate cannot afford it, then it is necessary for the heirs to borrow money and pay the fidyah." [Tuhfatul Ahbaab, page 89]*
The actual ruling of the Ahnaaf is contrary to this. In this regard, Imaam Qaadhi Khaan (rahmatullahi alaih) states, "*It is necessary for the deceased to make a bequest for fidyah. This is taken out only from a third of his wealth, according to us. If he does not make a bequest and the heirs give it from their own, then it will be permissible.*

However, if there is no bequest, then this is not binding on the heirs. This is according to us, and contrary to the view of the Shaafis." [Qaadhi Khaan, vol. 1, page 96]

When the fidyah is not even compulsory on the 1/3 of the estate if there is no bequest, how then can it be binding on the heirs to take a debt to pay the fidyah, if the estate does not have sufficient funds?

Passing around the Qur'aan

The mas'alahs regarding the Isaal-e-Thawaab of the deceased and a plan for accommodating the poor person who does not have enough wealth to fulfill his fidyah, have been discussed earlier.

There is no doubt that the Qur'aan Majeed is the everlasting Kalam of Allaah Ta'ala, which holds the cure for internal, external, physical and spiritual ailments. The Qur'aan Majeed being a means of Isaal-e-Thawaab has been established from authentic Ahaadith. **However, it has not been proven from any source that after the Janaazah the Qur'aan Shareef is passed over the deceased. Right across the entire ocean of Ahaadith Kitaabs no mention is found regarding this practice.** Nothing of this sort is found in the Shaafi, Maliki and Hambali Fiqh Kitaabs. Take a look at the Fiqhi Works of Imaam Abu Hanifah, Muhammad or Abu Yusuf (rahmatullahi alaihim) and there to you will not find anything. Even a thorough study of the Hanafi Fataawa Kitaabs, will yield nothing. In fact, you will not find mention of this practice anywhere in reliable Kitaabs. Death is a common thing, which has been carrying on throughout the ages. How is it then not even the Sahaabah τ thought up this plan of passing the Qur'aan over the deceased? The Fuqahaa of the Ahnaaf have stated that

every such plan which will save a Muslim from haraam or without harming the rights of others or incurring any Deeni crime, to acquire something Halaal, is correct and permissible. It should however be remembered that nothing new to the Deen must be introduced following the plan which is the result of one's own Qiyaas. Insofar as benefiting the deceased, our beloved Nabi ρ has shown us everything and the Sahaabah τ have practically demonstrated it all to us. If there is anything which they have not practiced, then be rest assured this is most certainly not beneficial for us and harmful. It was, after all, the plan of the *Ash'aab-e-Sabt*, which invited the Wrath and Anger of Allah Ta'ala to descend on them.

Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ reported, *"Indeed Rasulullaah ρ said, 'You should not put into motion such plots as the Jews had done, where you regard the haraam as Halaal by means of plans."* [Tafseer Ibn Katheer, vol. 2, page 257 / Durr-e-Manthoor, vol. 3, page 139]

In short, the practice of passing the Qur'aan Majeed over the deceased is an unacceptable one which has absolutely no basis in the Shariah and is not proven from anywhere.

Proof of the advocators

It is only appropriate that we cite the proof forwarded by those propagators of this practice and thereafter reply to it, academically. They aver that this practice was initiated by Hadhrat Umar τ. In this regard, Allamah Abu Laith Samarqandi (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 383 A.H] writes, *"Abbaas bin Sufyaan has reported from Ibn A'liyah, who reports from Ibn 'Aun, who reports from Muhammad, who narrates from Ibn Umar τ, who said, 'O believers! Make the Qur'aan the means of the salvation of the dead. Make a halqah (chain/band) and say, 'O Allaah! Save this*

deceased through the sanctity of this Qur'aan.' Then take turns in passing the Qur'aan around, from hand to hand...." [Fataawa Samarqandiya]

Reply: According to the science of Hadith, this narration is unacceptable. **Abu Laith Samarqandi (rahmatullahi alaih) is undoubtedly a great Faqeeh, but if we need guidance in the field of Hadith, then we refer to the Muhadditheen.** If we study this narration under the light of the *Asmaa-e-Rijaal*, then we will see the reality. **Firstly,** the narrator Abbaas bin Sufyaan is unknown. Nowhere in any of the Kitaabs of *Asmaa-e-Rijaal* can his name be found. **Secondly,** Imaam Abu Laith (rahmatullahi alaih) passed away in 383 A.H and Ibn A'liyah passed away in 193 or 194 A.H. and between them there is only one link. This appears strange since the gap between these two is about 189 years. The strangeness of this is not hidden from the experts in this science.

Besides these, there is discussion on many other aspects of this narration, which puts its veracity in doubt.

There are many reasons why this narration is unacceptable and laced with doubt:

Firstly, this narration is the concoction of some Raafidhi. The reason being that this plan is attributed to Hadhrat Umar, Uthmaan and Haroon Rashid. The name of Hadhrat Ali τ does not feature anywhere. Hadhrat Muaawiya has also been mentioned about, but in bad light.
Secondly, this narration also places in bad light the eras of Hadhrat Umar and Uthmaan τ in that people were careless regarding their Salaat and Fasting that this plan had to be implemented to 'save' them.

Thirdly, the narration mentions that this plan was implemented for a Sahaabi from the Ansaar. How absurd to imply that a Sahaabi τ of Nabi ρ was careless about this Salaat, that this plan had to be carried out for him, whereas we all know well that for the Sahaabah τ Salaat was the actual distinguishing factor between Muslim and kaafir.

Fourthly, we know that during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar τ the Qur'aan Majeed was present in full written form, so why was it that only a portion of the Qur'aan, from *Maaliya* to *'Amma Ya Tasaa'aloon* was being passed around, as mentioned in the narration, and not the entire Qur'aan Majeed?

Fifthly, if this practice was present and customary during the eras of Hadhrat Umar and Uthmaan τ and during the Khilaafat-e-Rasheedi, how is it that it never reached the Muhadditheen and Fuqahaa? It certainly is strange that this plan never reached the ears of the Ulama and Fuqahaa throughout the ages, that they could practice on it!

It is stated by the advocators of this practice that it is mentioned in Imaam Muhammad’s *Kitaabul Heyal*, *"Imaam Muhammad says, 'The easiest manner is that the heirs purchase an authentic and expensive copy of the Qur'aan and sell it (by way of a plan) to some poor person who will in turn give it back to the heir as a gift. The heir will again give it to the poor person who will give it back, until all the fidyah of the deceased is fulfilled."*

This 'proof' is false and spurious because firstly, there is no such Kitaab as *Kitaabul Heyal* of Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullahi alaih). In this regard, Mullah Abu Muhammad Abdul Qadir Al-Qarshi Al-Hanafi (rahmatullahi alaih) [passed away 775 A.H] writes, *"Abu Sulaimaan Al-Jurjaani said that people have spoken a lie*

about Imaam Muhammad. He has not authored any book called Kitaabul Heyal. There is only a Kitabul Heyal of Waariq." [Jawaahirul Mudhiyya, vol. 1, page 208]

The falsities and concoctions of the Ahle Bid'ah is plain for all to see. May Allaah Ta'ala save us all.

To keep names like 'Abdun Nabi' and 'Abdur Rasul'

Nabi ρ said that the best of names is Abdullaah, AbdurRahmaan, etc. (i.e. those attributed to Allaah Ta'ala, which are preceded by 'Abd')., and then those names which have the name Muhammad attached to it (like Muhammad Ebrahim, Muhammad Ismail, etc.)

The word 'Abd' is ambiguous and could mean an 'aabid (worshipper) or it could denote slavery, being a servant of someone. However, when it is used as a name then it is essentially in the meaning of Ibaadat (one who worships). Such names should be avoided which may indicate *shirk.* Hadhrat Shah Waliullah (rahmatullahi alaih) states, *"Amongst the types of shirk is also that they would keep names for their children like AbdulUzza, Abdus Shams, etc....Such names indicate and are signs of shirk, hence Shaari't has forbidden the use of such names."* [Hujjatullaah, vol. 1, page 63]

An explanation is offered in Nisai Shareef, that Uzza was a name of an idol they (pagan Arabs) would worship.

Imaam Ibn Hajar Makki (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"It is haraam to keep the name of 'Shahanshah', because this title is only for Allaah Ta'ala. Similarly, it is not correct to keep names such as Abdun Nabi, Abdul Kabah, Abdud Daar, Abdul Ali, Abdul Hussain, etc. because such names are indicative of shirk."* [Sharah Minhaaj]

Since the name Ali is also one of Allaah Ta'ala's attributes, if one keeps this name with the intention of its attribution being to Allaah Ta'ala, then it will be permissible. Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullahi alaih) writes, *"The name Abdun Nabi, which is in vogue is kufr. If the intention is to denote ownership (as in slavery), then it will not be shirk."* [Sharah Fiqh Akbar, page 238]

It does not mean that if this name is not shirk it is permissible to keep. To keep such names will still not be permissible. In this regard, Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullahi alaih) states, *"It is not permissible to keep names such as Abdul Haarith or Abdun Nabi. No consideration will be afforded to these name although they have become common."* [Mirqaat, vol. 9, page 106]

Question: Is it permissible to keep names such as Abdur Rasul or Abdul Hussain?

Answer: To keep any name with 'Abd' which is not attributed to Allaah Ta'ala is impermissible. Even though these names are not kept with the intention of shirk, there is the possibility of their being attributed to shirk. The Qur'aan Majeed and Ahaadith indicate towards the impermissibility of such names, and the Ulama of Islaam have discussed this matter in detail. [Majmoo'a Fataawa, vol. 2, page 327]

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan also declares, *"This prohibition is to the level of Tanzeehi. It is better to use 'Ghulaami' than 'Abdi'."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 363]

This all proves that to keep such names is at least Makrooh-e-Tanzeehi, because they are not free from denoting shirk. Although we will not say it is kufr as

Moulana Abdul Hayy has ruled, but this does not mean it is permissible.

The logic of Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan

Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"It is permissible to keep the names Abdun Nabi, Abdur Rasul, Abdul Mustafa, Abdul Ali, etc. Similarly, is it permissible to regard oneself as the slave of Nabi ρ. This is established from the Qur`aan Majeed, Ahaadith and statements of the Fuqahaa."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 361]

On the one hand the Mufti Saheb classifies the keeping of such names as Makrooh-e-Tanzeehi and on the other hand he avers that their validity can be found in Qur`aan Majeed, Ahaadith and statements of the Fuqahaa. If it were established in Qur`aan Majeed and Ahaadith, then how can it ever be Makrooh-e-Tanzeehi? They aver that the Aayat, *"Say (O Muhammad ρ)! O my servants who …"* has the possibility and indication that we are the servants of Nabi ρ because he addresses us such, is totally contrary to the import and spirit of the Qur`aan Majeed. In Surah Aale Imraan ruku 8, Allaah Ta`ala states clearly, *"It is not (possible) for any human being to whom Allaah has given The Kitaab, Al-Hukma and Prophethood to say to the people, 'Be my worshippers…'"* [Aayat 79]

In essence, to claim that Nabi ρ refers to people as his slaves is totally contrary to the meaning and import of the Qur`aan Majeed. This claim is totally baatil and spurious.

As for the statement of Hadhrat Umar τ who said, *"I was his ρ servant and slave",* refers to his time with Nabi ρ. The words before this statement of his, that is, *"Indeed I was with Rasulullaah ρ and I was his servant…"* indicates

and proves that he is referring to the time when he was in Nabi's ρ service whilst he ρ was alive. If his import was that he remains the slave of Nabi ρ (even after his demise), then he would not have added the first part of his sentence. **As for the statements of Moulana Rumi, etc. these are all subject to interpretation. They cannot be cited as proof for claiming servitude to Nabi ρ.**

We have stated before that Mufti Ahmad Yaar said that to keep such names (as Abdun Nabi etc.) is Makrooh-e-Tanzeehi, but he claims at another juncture, *"Yes, if in this era such names are kept to irritate and annoy the Deobandis and Wahaabis, then it is worthy of reward."* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 364]

These people (Ahle Bid`ah) have a strange and queer understanding of the Deen. An act, which by their own admission is Makrooh-e-Tanzeehi, but just because its perpetration will annoy and exasperate the Deobandis and Wahhabis, they deem it to be extra rewarding if they carry it out! *Subhaanallaah!* It appears that this crowd has not real Math-hab except opposing and conflicting with the Deobandis. This proves that these people have no real fear for Allaah Ta`ala and Aakahirah. Their aim and objective in life is something other than the Pleasure of Allaah Rabbul Izzat.

There are numerous other acts of Bid`ah which need to be refuted, however, the scope of one Kitaab is limited. Nevertheless, for any seeker of the truth this treatise should open up the mind. Insha-Allaah.

We will cite one Hadith Shareef and close this discussion. Imaam Abdur Razzaaq (rahmatullahi alaih) reports from Mu`ammar (rahmatullahi alaih) who reports from Zaid

(rahmatullahi alaih) who reports from Hadhrat Hasan τ who said,

"Rasulullaah ρ said, 'A little Sunnah act is better than a great bid`ah... Whosoever carries out a Sunnah is from me and whosoever turns away from my Sunnah is not from me." [Musannaf Abdir Razzaaq, vol. 1, page 291]

****

CONCLUSION

It is only appropriate that we briefly present here, for the benefit of the respected readers, some of the objections of the Ahle Bid`ah and our responses thereto, which will, Insha-Allah Ta`ala, put a neat closure to our treatise.

First Objection

The compilation of the Qur`aan Majeed, the placing of *I'raabs* (*fat-ha, damma, kasra—zabar, zer, pesh,* etc.) as is done today is also a bid`ah, because during the time of Nabi ρ it was not done so.

Reply

Imaam Jalaaluddeen Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The Qur`aan Majeed was, in its totality, scripted during the era of Nabi ρ. However, it was not all together (compiled in one book), neither were the Surahs in their respective order."*[Itqaan, vol. 1, page 57]

The authentic version is that the Surahs were all in order, as will be proven, Insha-Allaah Ta`ala.

Imaam Haarith Muhaasibi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The compilation of the Qur`aan Majeed is not an innovation or bid`ah, because Nabi ρ had instructed its compilation."* [Ibid. page 58]

Hadhrat Zaid bin Thaabit τ said that we had presented various parts of the Qur`aan Majeed before Nabi ρ.

Imaam Haakim (rahmatullah alayh), using this narration as proof states, *"In this is a clear proof that the Qur`aan Majeed was compiled during the era of Nabi ρ."* [Mustadrak, vol. 2, page 611]

The narration of Hadhrat Ibn Labeed Ansaari τ which appears in Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 99, is also proof that Nabi ρ was pleased with the compilation of the Qur`aan Majeed (in book form). The narration is Bukhaari Shareef

and others are famous where Hadhrat Umar τ advise Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ to compile the Qur`aan Majeed. [see Mishkaat Shareef, vol. 1, page 193]

The present compiled form of the Qur`aan Majeed was completed and finalised during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Uthmaan τ, which is why he was give the title, of *Jaami'ul Qur`aan*. It should, however be remembered and noted that the compilation was not wholly initiated and completed during the era of Hadhrat Uthmaan τ. It was begun from the time of Nabi ρ and underwent stages and phases. It was brought to finality and fruition during the era of Hadhrat Uthmaan τ. Imaam Ibn Hasaar (rahmatullah alayh) said that the present sequence of Surahs and Aayaat were compiled in accordance to the Wahi. Allaamah Kirmaani (rahmatullah alayh) said that the present sequence of Surahs is as it is in the *Low-e-Mahfoodh*. This is precisely the sequence which Nabi ρ used to recite annually to Hadhrat Jibraeel υ. Imaam Baihaqi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The Qur`aan was codified and sequenced in this order, insofar as Surahs and Aayaat are concerned, from the era of Nabi ρ."* [Itqaan, vol. 1, page 62]

Imaam Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The sequence of the Surahs (which we have today) has, without any difference of opinion amongst the believers, been instructed thus by Nabi ρ."* [Tafseer Itqaan, vol. 1, page 60]

In essence, the written form of the Qur`aan Majeed which we have today was also such during the era of Nabi ρ. The Khulafaa-e-Raashideen have embarked on the systematic and sequential compilation thereof, during their eras. This compilation was sanctioned unanimously by all the Sahaabah τ. In this regard, Shaatbi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Thus, there is not a single recorded difference*

amongst the Sahaabah τ regarding this action (i.e. compilation of Qur`aan Majeed)." [Al-I'tisaam, vol. 2, page 288]

Regarding the issue of the *I'raab*, there is sufficient difference of opinion pertaining to it. According to the discussions of Muhammed bin Ishaaq bin Nadeem (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 380 AH] and Qaadhi Shamsuddeen Ahmed bin Khalkaan (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 681 A.H] we understand that the *I`raabs* were instructed by Hajjaaj bin Yusuf [passed away 95 A.H]. According to Allamah Ibn Khalkaan (rahmatullah alayh) there is a difference of opinion as to who placed the *I`raabs* following the instructions of Hajjaaj bin Yusuf. One view is that it was Nasr bin Aamir (rahmatullah alayh) and another that it was Yahya bin Ya`mar (rahmatullah alayh). However it is stated in *Kitaabul-Awaa-il* that the first person to place *I`raabs* on the Qur`aan Shareef was Abul Aswad Du`ili (rahmatullah alayh) who was the student of Hadhrat Ali (radhiallahu anhu). According to numerous sources the first person to place *I`raabs* on the Qur`aan Shareef was Yahya in Ya`mar (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 87 A.H]. In any case this was carried out during the era of the Sahaabah τ. Even if we accept that it was done during the reign of Hajjaj bin Yusuf, then too it was done during the era of the Sahaabah τ, which continued even after Hajjaaj bin Yusuf's demise. Hadhrat Mahmood bin Labeed τ passed away in 96 after Hijri, Hadhrat Mahmood bin Rabee` τ passed away 99 A.H, Hadhrat Abu Umaamah Sahl bin Haneef τ passed 100 A.H, Hadhrat Harmaas bin Ziyaad Baahili τ passed away 102 A.H and Hadhrat Abu Tufail τ passed away 110 A.H. [see Taqreeb, page 348/Tahzeeb, vol.1 page 63/Al-Bidaaya Wa Nihaaya, vol. 9 page 190]

It has been discussed earlier in this **Kitaab that the practices during the Khairul Quroon are proofs in the Shariah. It is definitely incorrect to call any such act a bid'ah.**

Second Objection

The lecture before the Jumuah Khutbah is also a bid'ah, but you people also do it.

Reply

The lecture before the Jumuah Khutbah has been established from numerous Sahaabah τ. Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ used to deliver a lecture before the Khutbah of Jumuah, wherein he would narrate Ahaadith of Nabi ρ. When the Imaam would arrive to deliver the Khutbah, then Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ would cease his lecture. [Mustadrak, vol. 1, page 108 and vol. 3, page 512]

Abu Zaahiria (rahmatullahi alaih) says that Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Basar τ would deliver a sermon on the day of Jumuah before the Khutbah and would terminated when the Imaam would appear to give the Khutbah. [Haakim, vol. 1, page 288]

Hadhrat Tameem Daari τ asked permission from Hadhrat Umar τ to deliver sermons on a Friday before the Jumuah Khutbah wherein he would narrate incidents with advice and morals. Hadhrat Umar τ at first refused, and later, on Hadhrat Tameem's insistence, Hadhrat Umar consented and instructed him that he terminate his lecture as soon as enters to give the Khutbah. [Tazkeeratus Sahaabah, vol. 1, page 184]

Third Objection

During the era of Nabi ρ no arrangements were made for lighting in the Masjid, hence to arrange for such lighting in the Musaajid in our times is also a bid'ah. So, you people also practice bid'ah because your Musaajid also have lighting.

Reply

Imaam Abu Dawood (rahmatullahi alaih) has set up a chapter especially entitled, *"Baabus Sarji fil Musaajid" - Chapter on lighting in the Musaajid*. In this chapter, he has narrated a Hadith, wherein Nabi ρ said if one cannot attend Baitul Maqdis for performing Salaat, then *"send some olive oil, so that the lanterns in Baitul Maqdis be lit."* [Abu Dawood, vol. 1, page 66]

From this narration we see that Nabi ρ had instructed that olive oil be sent to Baitul Maqdis for its lanterns to be lit. Yes, however, during the blessed era of Nabi ρ no special arrangement was made for lighting in Masjid-e-Nabawi. Hadhrat Tameem Daari τ was the first to light a lamp in the Masjid and arrange for lighting for it. [Ibn Majah, page 56 / Tahzeeb, vol. 1. page 512]

Moulana Shibli (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Hadhrat Tameem Daari (rahmatullah alayh) lit lanterns in the Masjid with the consent of Hadhrat Umar τ.* [Al-Faarooq, vol. 2, page 142]

Note:

To provide more light than what is needed in a Masjid is Haraam. In this regard, Abu Hanifah the second, Allamah

Ibn Nujaim, Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"It is not permissible to add to the lanterns of the Masjid, because this is waste, regardless of whether this is during Ramadhaan or out…It is stated in Qunya that to light excessive lanterns in the marketplace on the Night of Bara'at is a bid`ah, similarly for the Masjid."* [Bahrur Raa'iq, vol. 5, page 215]

Fourth Objection

To arrange for carpets and flooring in a Masjid is also a bid'ah, because such was not the case during the blessed age of Nabi ρ.

Reply

True that during the era of Nabi ρ there was no special flooring in the Masjid, however, this was done during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar τ. As Allamah Shibli (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The first to arrange for flooring (in the Masjid) was Hadhrat Umar τ. However, this was no elaborate and gaudy flooring. It was in keeping with the simplicity advocated by Islaam, and was nothing other than a plain straw mat. The reason for using a mat was so that the clothes and body of the Musallis do not get soiled (with the sand, etc.)"* [Al-Faarooq, vol. 2, page 143]

The first person to initiate sweet scent for the Musaajid was Hadhrat Umar τ [see Khulaasatul Wafaa, page 147] and the first person to set up a screen for the Masjid was Hadhrat Uthmaan τ. [Mar`atul Haramain, vol. 1, page 235]

Fifth Objection

The *mihraab* in the Musaajid is also a bid`ah because there were no *mihraabs* during the era of Nabi ρ and you people use *mihraabs*.

Reply

Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Sharah Muhazzab*, vol. 3, page 202 and Allamah Samhoodi (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Wafaa-ul Wafaa*, vol. 1, page 173, that there was no *mihraab* during the time of Nabi ρ, but Allamah Badruddeen Aini Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Umdatul Qaari*, vol. 2, page 297, that Hadhrat Jibraeel υ came and set up a *mihraab*, showing the direction of the Kaabah to Nabi ρ. Allamah Maqrezi (rahmatullah alayh) states that although there was some sort of *mihraab* in existence even before, nevertheless, the hollow *mihraab* which is in vogue nowadays, has been built since the time of Hadhrat Umar bin Abdil Azeez (rahmatullah alayh). Allamah Maqrezi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"The mihraabs built by the Sahaabah τ in Misr and Iskandaria is in the direction of the sunrise during the winter season."* [Maqrezi, vol. 2, page 257]

Imaam Qaadhi Khaan Al-Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"Those Mihraabs which the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen set up…"* [vol. 1, page 33]

In essence, according to Imaam Aini (rahmatullah alayh) *mihraabs* were in existence during the era of Nabi ρ and according to many other Muhaqqiqeen, *mihraabs* were built by the Sahaabah τ and Tabieen (rahmatullah alayhim).

Sixth Objection

There were no Minaarats during the time of Nabi ρ, hence it is a bid'ah, and yet you people build minaarats in your Musaajid.

Reply

Minaarats were actually built for the purpose of giving Athaan, so that the call may be heard far and wide. In many large cities, few Athaans are being called out at the same time from their respective minaarats. In this regard, Imaam Dawood (rahmatullah alayh) has set up a special chapter, entitled, *Baabul Athaan fowqal Minaarat – Chapter on Athaan given from the minarat.* [vol. 1, page 77]

Hadhrat Abu Barza Ismali (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 65 A.H.] states, *"It is Sunnat to give the Athaan from the minaarat and the Iqaamat in the Masjid."* [Az-Zaila'i, vol. 1, page 293 / Musannif Ibn Abi Shaiba, vol. 1, page 224]

It is a principle of Hadith that the general usage of the term 'Sunnat' refers to the Sunnah of Nabi ρ. It is stated in *Taarikhul Islaam*, vol. 2, page 39, quoting from *Isaaba* that there were no minaarats in the Musaajid in Misr and Hadhrat Muslimah bin Mukhallad Ansaari (rahmatullah alayh) had constructed minaarats for all the Musaajid there. Qaadhi Shaukaani (rahmatullah alayh) [passed away 1255 A.H.] said that the objective of placing minaarats in the Musaajid is so that people from far off may hear the Athaan and this is a permissible reason for doing so.

Seventh Objection

Fridays are given off at your Madaaris, and this is a bid'ah

Reply

It has been established from the Qur`aan Majeed that special arrangements be made for the Jumuah Salaat on a Friday. It has also been established from authentic Ahaadith that on a Friday one should bath, wear clean clothes, make miswaak and try to be early for Jumuah Salaat. Therefore if Fridays are given off at the Madaaris based on the Fiqhi principle of: ***That upon which a Waajib depends on for fulfilment is also Waajib***, what then is the problem?

Besides this, it is stated in *Aqdul Fareed*, vol. 1, page 49 that Hadhrat Umar τ used to instruct his armies that they always halt (their journeys) on a Friday, and spend the entire day and night stationary. This was to be done that the people may take a break and prepare their clothes and weapons.

Eighth Objection

The establishment of Madaaris is bid'ah, because during the era of Nabi ρ there were no Madaaris. Since most of the Madaaris and students are from your Jamaat, therefore you people are also bid'atees.

Reply

This argument of the Ahle bid'ah is also a weak one, because to propagate and spread the Ilm-e-Deen in whatever way and avenue possible (provided it does not contravene the Shariah) is the actual purpose and object of the Deen. Therefore whatever avenue is adopted is acceptable and correct. During the era of Nabi ρ, **the *As-haab-e-Sufa*, who were the students of the Deen, were**

apportioned a separate platform on one side of the Masjid, which was for their convenience and ease, so that no difficulty is imposed on them.

Imaam Abu Is`haq Gharnaati (rahmatullah alayh) states, *"However the Madaaris are not regarded as Amr-e-Ta'abbudi, whereby it can be termed a bid'ah. Yes, if it is imposed that the Sunnat is only to impart knowledge in the Musaajid then it will be a different matter, whereas it is not such. In fact, since the beginning of time, knowledge has been spread and propagated from every corner. From the Masjid, home, on journey, while stationary, etc. even in the market place—knowledge is being taught. Therefore if anyone constructs a Madrasah with the intention of convenience for the students then what has he done besides constructing walls and a building? What bid'ah is being perpetrated here?"* [Al-I'tisaam vol. 1 page 272]

Ninth Objection

To establish a *dora Hadith* (final year) class in the Madaaris and to have *Imtihaan* (examinations) are also bid'ahs.

Reply

The mother tongue of the Arabs and Sahaabah τ was Arabic. They understood the Qur`aan Majeed without having to study the Arabic Grammar, contrary to the non-Arabs, who are constrained to learn the Arabic language first before embarking on a study of the Qur`aan Majeed and Ahaadith. This is the reason why one of the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen, Hadhrat Ali τ, instructed Abul Aswad to formulate such grammar rules for the Arabic language whereby non-Arabs may learn the language, and understand the Qur`aan Majeed [see *Matn-e-Mateen*, page

3, *Iqtiraahun lil Suyuti*, page 82 and *Bidaaya wan Nihaaya*, vol. 8, page 312]

Therefore, for a student of the Deen to properly learn and acquire the knowledge of the Qur`aan Majeed, a syllabus and system of study had to be set up by the Salf-e-Saaliheen. And here again, under the principle of: *That upon which a Waajib depends on for fulfilment is also Waajib*, undertaking such study is necessary. As for the question of *Imtihaan*—this is also not a bid'ah. Imaam Bukhaari (rahmatullah alayh) had set up a special chapter entitled, *Chapter of a leader stipulating such questions for his companions, whereby he tests their knowledge*.

Under this chapter he narrates a Hadith wherein Nabi ρ asks the Sahaabah τ to show him such a tree which does not shed its leaves. The Sahaabah τ in turn, each gave a reply in accordance to their understanding. Besides Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ, no one else knew the correct reply. However, Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ, owing to his young age, did not speak. Nabi ρ told them that it was the date-palm. Besides this narration, there are many others which show *Imtihaan* of sorts taking place.

Tenth Objection

It is a bid'ah to compile the Ahaadith Shareef in book-form.

Reply

The Ahaadith Shareef was even written during the era of Nabi ρ. Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ said that no one knew more Ahaadith than him, besides Hadhrat Abdullaah ibn

Umar τ because he would write them down. [Bukhaari Shareef, vol. 1, page 22]

The total number of Ahaadith reported by Hadhrat Abu Hurairah τ was 5374. A treatise entitled *Saheefa Abu Hurairah* was prepared wherein the narrations of Hadhrat Abu Hurairah are recorded. They were compiled from what he used to write down. The compilation of Hadhrat Abdullaah Ibn Umar τ was entitled *Saadiqah*. This has been recorded in the history books. In essence, to claim that Ahaadith were not written during the era of Nabi ρ and that they were not gathered into compilations is a clear slander and false claim.

Eleventh Objection

To teach for a salary and to have *Khatam-e-Bukhaari* are also bida'hs.

Reply

The entire discussion on this subject has passed earlier on, that although there was a slight difference of opinion amongst the *Mutaqaddimeen*, the *Muataakh-khireen,* amongst whom are the Author of Hidaaya, vol. 4, page 15, Imaam Qaadhi Khaan, vol. 4, page 794 and Imaam Sarakhsi in *Binaaya*, vol. 3, page 655 have all consented to it (i.e. stipulating salary for teaching). The references from Bahrur Raa'iq and others had also been mentioned earlier, and also that the Khulafaa-e-Raashideen had stipulated salaries for Imaams, Muath-thins, etc. A full discussion on this has passed, hence there is no further need for repetition. As also mentioned it is permissible to take remuneration for reciting Qur'aan Majeed for purpose of Ta'weez or if someone is in problems. Allamah Badruddeen Aini (rahmatullahi alaih) states that it is

permissible to take remuneration for *amals*, ta'weez, etc. [Al Binaayah, vol. 3, page 654]

Respected and beloved readers! There are many other objections raised by the opponents, however, we have presented but a few as an example. These should be sufficient for any intelligent seeker of the truth.

The pointers which we have listed are not merely of the masses, but the great, great *Muhaqqiqs* of the Ahle Bid'ah raise these objections. In this regard, Mufti Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes, *"Because the Madrasahs of the Deobandis, their syllabi, Dora Hadith Shareef, salaries of staff, Imtihaanaat, the placing of the I'raabs in the Qur'aan Majeed, compilation of the Qur'aan Majeed and Ahaadith Shareef, Khatam Bukhaari, ..the scripting of Qur'aan Majeed, placing of rukus therein, making it into 30 parahs, etc. are all Deeni practices and bid'ahs as well, because all these things were not done during the era of Nabi ρ. Tell us, is this Halaal or Haraam?"* [Jaa-al Haqq, page 212] Our replies to all these issues have been given earlier.

In conclusion, I make dua that Allaah Ta'ala grant us all the *Taufeeq* and guidance to walk in the footsteps of Nabi ρ and his Sahaabah τ. This is the only means of attaining the Pleasure of Allaah Rabbul Izzat. The path of sin, most certainly does not make Him pleased.

Those things which Nabi ρ had not practiced upon is a Sunnah for us not to do those things. It is stated in the Hadith Shareef, *"Indeed Allaah Ta'ala loves that His concessions be practice upon (taken advantage of) just as He detests that He be disobeyed."* [Ahmad/Ibn Khuzaima/Fataawa Ibn Taimiya, vol. 1 page 150]

This narration is reported in Masnad Ahmad, vol. 2, page 108, Mauwaariduz Zam'aan pages 228 and 145 and Durr-e-Manthoor, vol. 1, page 193, from Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ and also on page 228 from Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ.

May Allaah Ta'ala grant us the good fortune to imitate the lives of the Sahaabah τ.

Hadhrat Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullahi alaih) states in commenting on the Hadith regarding the Sahaabah τ being very informal that they would not recite Thikr and Durood Shareef in the Musaajid or at their homes in congregation or loudly. Externally they were with the creation, but spiritually and internally, they were apart. They were, in fact, with Allaah Ta'ala. [Mirqaat, vol. 1, page 260]

Shaatbi (rahmatullahi alaih) states, *"Raising the voices in the Musaajid, is in reality creating strife in the Deen and establishing a bid'ah."* [Al-I'tisaam, vol. 2, page 256]

O our Master! You are Independent. Please do forgive the external and internal flaws of this writer. Besides You who else is there who can forgive? O our Creator! Grant us salvation from physical and spiritual ailments. Besides You, who else is there to whom we may spread our hands? Which other door can we go to, if we abandon Yours? You please have mercy on us.

Translation Edited by Mufti A. H. Elias
Eid Day 1427 / 2006 December – Zill Hajj